

Desk

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 27 1958

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 1, JANUARY 1958

-
- 1 "Wulf and Eadwacer": An Interpretation. JOHN F. ADAMS
 - 6 Chapman's Plagiarism of Poliziano's *Rusticus*. S. K. HENINGER, JR.
 - 8 Milton's Criticism of Hall's Grammar. ERNEST SIRLUCK
 - 9 Satan's Disguises: *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*.
JACKSON I. COPE
 - 12 Some Heroic Couplets by James Thomson. ALAN D. MCKILLOPP
 - 15 Transmutation in Crane's Imagery in *The Bridge*. BERNICE SLOTE
 - 23 Santayana and Literary Tradition. WILLIAM BYSSHE STEIN
 - 25 Les *Foresteries* de Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaie et les productions
pastorales de la Pléiade. MARC BENSIMON
 - 33 Cervantes and the "Caballero Fonseca." WARREN T. MCCREADY
 - 36 Manuscrits de Pierre Bayle. LEIF NEDERGAARD
 - 39 The Contribution of a Directoire Exile to a Poem of Alfred de
Musset. JAMES L. SHEPHERD, III
 - 46 The Prototype for Proust's Jean Santeuil. WILLIAM STEWART BELL
 - 50 *Gomia* versus *Gumia*, *Gomia*: an Emendation. FRANCIS G. VERY
 - 52 Some Unidentified Early English Translations from Herder's
Volkslieder. KARL S. GUTHKE

REVIEWS

- 57 JOHN PETER, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* (LEICESTER BRADNER)
- 58 SEARS JAYNE and FRANCIS R. JOHNSON, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* (LEICESTER BRADNER)
- 60 GEORGE DE F. LORD, *Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman* (RICHMOND LATTIMORE)
- 64 NORMAN E. ELIASON, *Tarheel Talk: An Historical Study of the English Language in North Carolina to 1860* (W. CABELL GREET)
- 67 JOSÉ MARÍA AZACETA, ed., *Cancionero de Juan Fernández de Ixar* (BRUCE W. WARDROPPER)
- 68 MICHAEL RIFFATERRE, *Le Style des Pléiades de Gobineau, essai d'application d'une méthode stylistique* (LEO SPITZER)
- 74 ANDRÉ MARTINET, *La Description phonologique, avec application au parler franco-provençal d'Hauteville (Savoie)* (ROBERT L. POLITZER)
- 77 DIDRIK ARUP SEIP, *Palaeography B Norge og Island* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 79 GUSTAF LINDBLAD, *Studier i Codex Regius av äldre Eddan. With an English Summary* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
CLIFTON C. CHERPACK
STEFÁN EINARSSON
RENÉ N. GIRARD
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
KARL LUDWIG SELIG
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress 16 July 1894.

egh
2.25
.00
uld
Md.
ipu
The
ery
urn
are
Md.
of
ress

n
l
n

“

p
u
o
th
b
a
b
i
t
o
t

gh
25
00.
ld
d.
ou
he
ry
m
re

ed.
of
an,

805
m69
L3m

modern language notes

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 1, JANUARY 1958

"Wulf and Eadwacer": An Interpretation

In common with the majority of surviving Anglo-Saxon poems, the poem immediately preceding the riddles in the *Exeter Book*¹ is untitled in the manuscript, and has been called "Wulf and Eadwacer," or simply "Eadwacer," for the sake of convenient reference. Possibly the understanding of this poem has been made to suffer from its having been given a title at all. A certain circularity may have been entailed as a result, perpetuating the theory that *Eadwacer* in the text must be a personal name because it is a personal name in the title! The interpretation offered here is based on my belief that as it occurs in the poem *Eadwacer* is not a character at all, that the word is rather the common noun *eadwacer*, "property watcher," and that it is used in the context ironically.

Essentially this interpretation is a modification of the premise offered by Henry Bradley in 1888, and still widely held, that the poem is a dramatic monologue spoken by a woman. My reading differs from his, and others based on his interpretation, in that I reduce the number of characters in the piece from three—the speaker, her lover Wulf, and her husband Eadwacer—to two: speaker and lover.

In his edition of *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*,² Frederick Tupper,

¹ George Philip Krapp and Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, *The Exeter Book* (New York, 1936), pp. 179-80.

² *The Riddles of the Exeter Book* (Boston, 1910), p. 249.

Jr. glosses the word *Eadwacer* as a proper name, a possible variant of *Odoacer*. Similarly, other interpretations of the poem as a dramatic monologue depend on the word being a proper name, either in its own right or as a variant of *Odoacer*. The function of this character in the poem depends upon the interpretation of the text, and varies with the individual critic. By translating this one word literally, however, a way is left open to explicate the central obscurity of the poem, that is, to say what the poem is about, with a minimum residue of obscurities.

Bosworth and Toller define the noun *eadwacer* as "a watchman of property,"³ and Toller adds in the 1921 supplement, "easily roused, alert, vigilant. Also as a proper name."⁴ Grein calls it, "wächter des Gutes."⁵ The context of the poem demands either a proper noun or an epithet of some sort: "Gehyrest þu, Eadwacer?" I believe it could better be an epithet: an ironic reference to Wulf, who is the woman's lover and the father of her child, but who is not her husband. If it is taken in this sense, the speaker is ironically bestowing on the man a character which the context implies most emphatically he lacks, that of being a protector and guardian of his home. While the irony could be also applied to a wandering husband, I will try to show that the poem may be more fully explicated if their relationship lacks a binding religious or legal sanction.

The speaker is an abandoned, or what amounts to the same thing, semi-abandoned, woman. Wulf, her lover, is a wanderer, perhaps a retainer for an eorl or member of a party of perennial sea rovers. Wulf's way of life (as much of it as is suggested by the poem), and the natural defensibility of his island retreat mentioned in the poem rather suggests this last: the island stronghold of such a band as the *Holmsvikings*. One is further reminded by the circumstances of the poem of the code of the *Holmsvikings*, which did not allow women within the stronghold, nor allow its members to be absent for longer than three days.⁶ To fictionalize for the sake of clarification, the speaker might be considered to be Wulf's sweetheart in a village in the next fiord.

³ Joseph Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford, 1898), p. 225.

⁴ T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, Supplement* (London, 1921), p. 164.

⁵ C. W. M. Grein, *Sprachschatz der Angelsächsischen Dichter* (Cassel, 1861), I, 253.

⁶ *The Saga of the Jónsvíkings*, trans. Lee M. Hollander (Austin, 1955), p. 63.

If the relation is seen to be that of a woman who has no actual claim on her man other than his own uncertain affections, and who is able to see him no oftener than dictated by his own whims and the fortunes of sea-roving, it is possible to offer a tentative explanation for the obscurity of the first two lines.

Leodum is minum swylce him mon lac gife;
Willað hy hine aþeegan, gif he on þreat cymeð.

One can infer through the construction of these two lines that some kind of poetic parallel between them is intended. The context suggests this parallel to be in the contrast between the insecurities of her own life and the relative security of Wulf's. She compares her own destiny to that of a gift. He who "bestowed" her, obviously without the "gift's" concurrence, relieved himself of all responsibility for her. The line may be saying in poetic terms that by not carrying her away he has in effect given her back to her own kinsmen whom she should have forsaken to follow him. I offer this explanation merely as plausible, and do not mean that it unravels all of the obscurities and ambiguities of these lines.

Lines 4 to 8 present no particular problem of interpretation, developing the contrast suggested by the refrain line between her own tenuous existence and the relative security of Wulf's life. The difficulties of the third "stanza," lines 9 to 15, can be reduced by an imaginative sympathy with the speaker, and the allowance of a certain poetic liberty. In substance she describes the heart-break and uncertainty of waiting for the one she loves who is off at sea. In contrast to his apparent indifference to her own problems of feeding and protecting the child and herself, bad weather makes her weep for the possible discomfort and danger Wulf faces exposed to the elements in his adventures at sea. On the rare occasion of his visits she experiences a dual attitude towards his embrace, ecstasy for the pleasure of the moment, but with concurrent misery in her knowledge that it soon must end: Wulf will return to sea, she must remain behind in renewed uncertainty.

Lines 13 to 15 continue this theme of the misery and loneliness of the periodic separations, building to the climax of the poem and the most telling expression both literally and poetically of her situation as a lover. In conventional poetic phraseology, she says that uncertain love has made her ill. While the expression is striking in its own honest poignancy, the effect is greatly increased by the specific force of the

passage, "murnende mod, nales meteliste." The effect of the contrast is strengthened by the aptness of this expression to the situation. The sickness is not merely a conventional love sickness: She makes the simile more telling by specifying a particular sickness-hunger. No doubt the possibility of hunger would have been ever present to anyone of the day, but to a woman in her situation the passage is especially applicable, carrying with it implications which immediately reflect on Wulf. And although she is in present want, to her the pain of being separated from Wulf is greater than her own hunger.

The poem as an appeal for Wulf to settle down shifts grounds at this point, taking a new orientation suggested by the simile between longing and hunger. So far her appeal has been on the basis of the mutual give and take of a love affair, but in final terms this situation is not simply a matter between two lovers that can be settled in terms of love; Wulf's obligation is greater than merely doing right by his mistress's affections. She now takes a scathing new tack, which ultimately reflects on his manhood. For herself she might prefer to rest her appeal solely on that slender tie between them—love—but as their child is involved, she cannot rest on love and honor alone. After the emotional climax of the preceding stanza, in lines 15-18 she prepares to give a rational appeal through an anticlimax, taking its effect from the quality of understatement of juxtaposing the literal situation against the love situation. She begins with what I take to be vitriolic irony in the word *eadwacer*; "Do you hear, 'home-protector?' The wolf carries our child to the woods." There does not seem to be any legitimate question of a wolf, real or as a figure for marauders, or of a physical carrying off of the child, being involved. Certainly the context of the poetic statements throughout the piece justifies this conventional figure for hard times, if it needs specific justification. It further seems quite likely that she was not unaware of the effect of the word as a pun on Wulf's name.

The last line "Uncer giedd geador," I believe makes better sense if the word *giedd* is taken in its sense as *riddle* rather than as *song*. Translated in this way the sense of the last two lines is that their "marriage" illustrates a "riddle," ironical in its obviousness: things never joined are easily separated. The body of the poem might be called a pointed statement to which she here appends the final remark, "Now you figure it out!"

To somewhat vindicate the critics who have interpreted this poem as a riddle, I think there is an interesting possibility that the poet

actually wrote this poem in the riddle "form"; that he made use of certain conventions of the riddle in the same spirit poets of a more fully developed lyric tradition made use of the sonnet, or any other conventional verse form. The movement of the poem and the style of development are similar to the riddle, and the specific reference of the last two lines is quite suggestive. The riddle becomes an ironic backdrop and makes the final focus of the appeal to Wulf that of moral obligation. The riddle ending also adds to the tone a note of bitterness for the speaker's own situation, that she must make her final appeal in terms of something other than the genuine love which she feels for him and which she longs to have reciprocated as love, not merely from the obligation of necessity.

Interpreted in this way, with two characters instead of three, the poem becomes a unified and sharply focused lyric rather than a fragment or lyric of doubtful coherence. While my interpretation may not account for all the obscurities, the remaining points of doubt seem to be questions of comprehending its poetic complexity rather than major problems of focus and unity. The obscurities which remain represent features which would in any poem resist paraphrase.

EADWACER

Our fate like a gift's, by the giver unvalued;
Friends will assist him if hardship should threaten;
 It is not so with us.

Wulf is on one island, I on another:
His island held safe by a bordering mire;
Warriors dwell there, in battle his comrades—
Friends will assist him if hardship should threaten;
 It is not so with us.

Wulf's days of wandering were my days of torment;
I wept for Wulf when the weather was rainy.
Yet when he clasped me fast in his arms,
My joy was great, but they held grief, too.
Wulf, my Wulf, hoping for you,
For your seldom visit, has brought on me sickness:
The longing of heart, not my hunger for food.

Do you hear, Cradle-Watcher, the lank wolf
Carries our eaglet to the woods.—
Easily a man tears apart what was never joined:
 Our bond is this riddle.

University of Washington

JOHN F. ADAMS

Chapman's Plagiarism of Poliziano's *Rusticus*

When George Chapman wrote *Eugenia*, he took great pains to follow the fashion for over-wrought elegies and to parade his not inconsiderable learning. For these purposes, he introduced the passage of pathetic fallacy by means of a long list of storm-tokens which presage the universal disruption which naturally will follow Lord Russell's death.¹ Precedents for the catalogue of storm-tokens were available in the works of Theophrastus, Aratus, Vergil, and Pliny;² but Chapman did not draw his weather-lore directly from these ancient authors. Instead, he lifted his list of *tempestatis praesagia* from a Renaissance source, from the oft-reprinted *Rusticus* of Angelo Poliziano. Sixty-eight lines of *Eugenia* are simply a translation of fifty-eight lines very near the end of Poliziano's work.

The passage in Chapman begins:

They saw the sun looke pale, and east through aire,
Discoullor'd beames.

(lines 55-56)

Poliziano had written:

Consulit & Phœbi flammæ, an grandinis augur
Palleat, an radiis monstret discordibus imbrem.³

The passage in Chapman ends:

The wolfe hould in her den; Th' insatiate beast,
Now fearing no man, met him brest to brest,
And like a murtherous begger, him allur'd;
Haunting the home-groues husbandmen manur'd.

(lines 119-122)

Poliziano had written:

Cumque antro lupo exululat, cumque improbus idem,
Nec metuens hominum, propius consistit, & offert
Se mendicanti similem, ac loca culta pererrat.

The fidelity of Chapman's translation can be illustrated by placing a few lines beside Poliziano's original:

¹ See my article, "The Tempestatis Praesagia in Chapman's *Eugenia*," *MLN*, LXX (1955), 478-484.

² *De signis*, *Phaenomena*, *Georgics* (Book I), and *Historia naturalis* (Book XVIII), respectively.

³ *Rusticus*, printed with *Hesiodi Ascræi opuscula inscripta* "Ἐργα καὶ ἡμέραι, sic nunc latine reddita" (Basle, 1539), p. 145. All references to Poliziano are made to this volume, pp. 145 ff.

The wanton Swallows Iirekt the standing springs
 Met in dull lakes; and flew so close, their wings
 Shau'd the top waters: Frogs crokt; the Swart crow
 Measur'd the sea-sands, with pace passing slow,
 And often souc't her ominous heat of blood
 Quite ouer head and shoulders in the flood,
 Still scoulding at the Raines so slow accesse.

(lines 69-75)

At lasciua lacus alis præstringit hirundo,
 Et summas prope radit aquas, ranæque coaxant.
 Fusca gradu cornix lento metitur harenas,
 Aut fluuium capite, & madida ceruice receptat,
 Crocituque graui pluuiam increpat usque morantem.

Chapman translated exactly, changing Poliziano's Latin little more than to add a few words to pad out the metre.

In some instances, however, Chapman mistranslated with interesting implications. Poliziano, writing an Italianate pastoral, had imaginatively observed:

Clangunt Naupliadæ volucres, & peruia pinnis
 Nubila conscribunt.

Poliziano was drawing upon the legend that Palamedes, the son of Nauplius, invented several letters of the Greek alphabet by watching cranes in flight;⁴ so he indited the conceit that the *Naupliadæ volucres* are writing with their wings for the rain-bearing clouds. Chapman, however, missed the point because he was ignorant of the legend, and he lamely translated:

The trumpet throated, the *Naupliades*,
 Their clangers threw about, and summond vp
 All cloudes to crowne imperious tempests cup.

(lines 76-78)

Then he offered a misinformed gloss: "Cranes cald the Naupliades of Nauplius King of Euboeai turnd to a Crane."

Chapman was also unaware that foul weather was forecast by ashes clinging to the bottom of a pot, and by cattle licking their coats against the pile and lying on their right side, so he mistranslated the following two passages:

⁴ See, for example, Joannes Ravisius Textor, *Officina* (Venice, 1566-1567), Book II, fol. 108.

Prunaque concretusque ima cinis hæret in olla,
Carboque pellucet.

The Cloddie Ashes, kept coales long aliue,
And Dead Coales quickn'd; both transparent cleere.
(lines 98-99)

. . . dextrumque [boves] latus consternere gaudent,
Aut lingunt aduersa pilos.

. . . [Cattle] their haire
Lickt smooth at all parts; lou'd their rightside laire.
(lines 113-114)

Chapman was evidently hurrying to provide an ornamented elegy for Lord Russell as quickly as possible.

Here is yet another instance of plagiarism in Chapman, the most extensive yet uncovered. It shows once again that he did not scruple to trick himself out in another man's classical finery.

Duke University

S. K. HENINGER, JR.

Milton's Criticism of Hall's Grammar

The agony of finding a printer's error too late is an occupational hazard of authorship, but Bishop Hall may well be thought to have suffered too much from one such error. Milton, in the *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence* (1641), made heavy sport of Hall's grammar:

Remon. Let the boldest forehead of them all deny that *Episcopacie* hath continued thus long in our Iland, or that any till this age contradicted it.

Ans. That bold forehead you have cleanly put upon your selfe, 'tis you who deny that any till this Age contradicted it; no forehead of ours dares do so much: you have row'd your selfe fairly between the *Scylla* and *Charibdis* either of impudence, or nonsense, and now betake you to whether you please.¹

Hall has never been defended against Milton's taunt, although his prose style has often been praised and it might have been guessed that he had not earned such chastisement.

There has been no bibliographical examination of Hall's *Defence*

¹ *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don M. Wolfe et al. (New Haven: Yale University Press), Vol. I (1953), p. 701.

of the *Humble Remonstrance Against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smectymnuus* (1641), but it is demonstrable that there were two editions. The edition represented by copies in the British Museum (shelfmark 700.e.17.(5)) and in the Newberry Library shows that what Hall actually wrote made perfect sense: "or *say* that any till this age contradicated it" (p. 45; italics added). However, before some new Liljegren discovers this reading and accuses Milton of having invented the fault which he then denounced, let it be said that a copy in the University of Chicago Library has the text as Milton gives it.² Whether, before thus exploiting what he must have suspected was a printer's slip, Milton (who had had his own experience of print-shops) ought to have checked other copies of the pamphlet, is not a question which will greatly worry those familiar with the mores of seventeenth century controversy.

University of Chicago

ERNEST SIRLUCK

Satan's Disguises:

Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained

Milton chose to bind his epics together with many links; one of some interest has not been observed. In *Paradise Lost* Satan watches Adam and Eve take repast soon after his arrival, watches them then in "youthful dalliance as beseems/ Fair couple, linkt in happie nuptial League" (IV, 338-9), while "About them frisking playd/ All Beasts of th' Earth, since wilde" (IV, 340-1). Goaded by their bliss, his own loss redoubled in poignancy, Satan bursts into a twisted justification of his own plans to betray them, then settles to the business of discovering an opening in the armor of their innocence:

Down he alights among the sportful Herd
Of those fourfooted kindes, himself now one,
Now other, as thir shape servd best his end

² When this difference was shown to Professor J. H. Hanford, then Research Fellow at the Newberry Library, and Robert Rosenthal, Curator of Special Collections at the University of Chicago Library, they undertook a full bibliographical analysis of Hall's pamphlet, with very interesting results (to be published in *Studies in Bibliography*, v. XII).

Neerer to view his prey, and unespi'd
 To mark what of thir state he more might learn
 By word or action markt: about them round
 A Lion now he stalkes with fierie glare,
 Then as a Tyger, who by chance hath spi'd
 In some Purlieu two gentle Fawnes at play,
 Strait couches close, then rising changes oft
 His couchant watch, as one who chose his ground
 Whence rushing he might surest seize them both
 Gript in each paw: (iv, 396-408)

In these guises he learns of the "easie charge" given Adam and Eve concerning the tree of knowledge, and thus opens the gateway to pernicious persuasion through which he will later pass in the form of the serpent.

When noting how the Christ of *Paradise Regained*, his forty days ended, "hunger'd then at last/ Among wild Beasts" (I, 309-10), the commentators have pointed to Isaiah and Ezekiel on the ultimate amity among the denizens of the wilderness: "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together." True, the beasts in Milton's desert "at his sight grew mild" (I, 310). But this is to miss the detail in the broad light of tradition: when he elaborates, Milton settles upon just those beasts who do *not* grow mild:

The fiery Serpent fled, and noxious Worm,
 The Lion and fierce Tiger glar'd aloof. (I, 312-3)

Here again are the animal masks of the betrayer in *Paradise Lost*. Satan has already articulated awareness of his role as the Serpent, the noxious worm, and Christ's role as the seed; never has he felt to be more imminent "that fatal wound,/[which] Shall be inflicted by the Seed of *Eve*/ Upon my head" (I, 53-5). Thus the symbolic nature of the fleeing serpents almost totally suppresses their literal being: here we cannot help but see Satan through the guise. I suggest that Milton would at this point raise another muted echo of the past, that he would have readers of *Paradise Lost* realize that in inspecting the second Adam, the eternal fiend assumed the same beast forms of lion and tiger which had proved so useful in his victory over the old Man. But history has shifted the balances, and Satan knows that "*Adam* first of Men,/ . . . to this Man [was] inferior far" (II, 133-5). So the disguise must change: if God has become man, so must the tempter. And as the serpent, lion and tiger dissolve into the distanceless horizon of *Paradise Regained*, Christ sees the traditional spectre:

"now an aged man in Rural woods,/ . . . He saw approach" (I, 314-9).¹

Washington University

JACKSON I. COPE

¹The lion echoes *I Peter* 5: 8: "your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." But the more pertinent reference is probably *Job* 4: 10-11. Here the Vulgate presents both the lion and tiger. Coverdale converted the tiger also into a lion, a reading made traditional through the King James Bible. But the Vulgate tradition had been carried into English by the Wycliff Bible, which reads: "The roring of a leoun, and the vois of a leounesse, and the teth of leoun whelpis ben tobrosid. The tigre perishide, forþi that he hadde no prei; and the leoun whelpis ben scatterid" (*The Holy Bible . . . in the Earliest English Versions made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers* ed. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden [Oxford, 1850], II, 678). I quote from the earlier MSS.; the later version reads "tigris . . . sche." The relation between elements in the bestiaries and encyclopedists seem to indicate some confusion of sex, perhaps owing to the feminine gender of *rhypis*. The patristic tradition, however, frequently made the Miltonic identification of Satan with the male of the species. The anonymous *Allegoriae in universam Sacram Scripturam* (attributed by Migne to Rabanus Maurus) is pertinent: *Tigris est hypocritica, ut in Job: 'Tigris periit, eo quod non haberet praedam,' quod tunc se quodammodo hypocritica perire putat, quando praedam humani favoris rapere non valet* (PL, CXII, 1066). Alanus de Lille, *Distinctiones dictionum theologicalium* implies much the same role, this time for an explicitly diabolical tiger: *Tigris . . . Dicitur diabolus vel haereticus, qui cum non invenit quem decipiat, in se quodammodo deficit, unde in Job: Tigris perit [sic] eo quod non haberet praedam . . .* (PL, CCX, 973). Gregory's *Moralia in Job* considerably elaborates the identification of the hypocrite, the devil and the tiger, while also indicating the rationale for the tradition of the diabolic lion: *Quia natura uniuscujusque rei ex diversitate componitur, in sacro eloquio per rem quamlibet licite diversa figurantur. Habet quippe leo virtutem, habet et saevitiam. Virtute ergo Dominum, saevitia diabolum signat. . . . Hunc vocabulo tigridis repetit quem leonis appellatione signavit. Satan quippe et propter crudelitatem leo dicitur, et propter multiformis astutiae varietatem non incongrue tigris vocatur. Modo enim se sicut est perditus humanis sensibus objicit, modo quasi angelum lucis ostendit. Modo stultorum mentes blandiendo persuadet, modo ad culpam terrendo pertrahit. Modo suadere vitia aperte nititur, modo in suis suggestionibus sub virtutis specie palliatur. Haec itaque bellua, quetanta varietate respergitur, jure tigris vocatur, . . .* (PL, LXXV, 701-2. Gregory's discussion was reproduced verbatim in the 9th-century Rabanus Maurus' *De universo libri viginti duo* [PL, CXI, 218-9]). Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiarum* was probably the locus classicus for the frequent statement that the tiger *Est enim bestia variis distincta maculis* (PL, LXXXII, 434; cf. Hugo of St. Victor, *De bestiis*, lib. III, cap. i [PL, CLXXVII, 83]; Rabanus Maurus, *De universo*, op. cit.; T. H. White, *The Book of Beasts . . . a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century* [New York, 1954], p. 12). The *Glossa Ordinaria* in the ninth century lucidly paraphrases Gregory's development of these *maculae* into the symbols of hypocrisy: *Tigridi etiam Job comparat pro maculis simulationis. Hypocrita enim, qui rectus videtur, habet latentia vitia, quae aliquando erumpentia colorem variant. Praeda est justorum gloria, quam sibi arripit: putant ergo iste sanctum Job bona quae in eo noverat, per hypocritam tenuisse, dicit: 'Tigris periit.' Hoc est varietas tuae simulationes extincta est, etc. usque ad hi tales per capientiam putant se omnes transcendere* (PL, CXIII, 765).

Some Heroic Couplets by James Thomson

The following verses in the hand of James Thomson, author of *The Seasons*, are in British Museum Addit. MS. 4457, f. 117:

Bear me some God to Baia's gentle seats,
And cover me in Umbria's green retreats:
Where even rough rocks with tender myrtle bloom.
And trodden woods send out a rich perfume,
Where western gales eternally reside,
And all the seasons lavish all their pride:
Blossoms, and fruits, and flowers together rise,
And the whole year in gay confusion lies.

Snatch me some God from Baia's desert [gentle *deleted*] seats,
And bear me swift o'er Umbria's wild retreats:
Where rifted rocks with steaming sulphur glow,
And the whole earth is vaulted fire below:
From cavern'd winds where midnight earthquakes spring,
And the south shakes his pestilential wing:
Unblest by culture, where crude harvests rise,
And, Art and Nature, all in ruins lies.

Though these lines have not hitherto been identified as Thomson's, it seems certain that they are in his handwriting and that he composed them himself. Addit. MS. 4457 is made up of miscellaneous pieces preserved by Dr. Thomas Birch; a transcript of these same verses in Birch's hand is at f. 116. It may be noted also that at f. 115 there is a piece beginning "Sweet Tyrant Love, o hear me now," not in Thomson's hand, which has found its way into the Thomson canon from another transcript.¹ Birch, a zealous compiler and a lover of collectanea, was an acquaintance and associate of Thomson's from about the year 1735.

This short piece can be directly connected with the contrasting views of Italy presented at length in Book I of *Liberty*. Thomson here uses the heroic couplet to give us the same contrast in brief. The first section takes us to the setting which Thomson presents in other references to the beauties of ancient Italy, to

Baia's viny coast, where peaceful seas
Fanned by kind zephyrs, ever kiss the shore
(*Liberty*, I, 58-60) —

to the neighborhood of Naples,

¹ Printed and attributed to Thomson in William Hone's *Table-Book* (1828), ii, 380.

Once the delight of Earth,
Where art and nature, ever smiling, joined
On the gay land to lavish all their stores
(*Liberty*, I, 277-79) —

or to

Campania's fertile plains
And all the green delights of Italy
(*Summer*, 955-56)²

The second section gives the view of Italy in ruin found in *Liberty*, I, 280-315. This part of *Liberty* can be documented from the travel books Thomson used—from Burnet, Addison, and Edward Wright's *Observations*.³ The geographical detail in the lines above is of course slight, but we may note the connection with the "midnight earthquakes" and "mining fires" of Vesuvius (*Liberty*, I, 283), and we need not labor to prove that the couplet

Where rifted rocks with steaming sulphur glow,
And the whole earth is vaulted fire below

is also to be associated with descriptions of Vesuvius. This couplet is also parallel to the lines on earthquakes and thunderstorms in *Summer* (ll. 1097-98, 1108-09).

Both sections associate themselves furthermore with *Liberty*, I, 145-72, a passage describing the deterioration of nature in modern Italy. With the second couplet of the first section compare

In vain, forlorn in wilds, the citron blows;
And flowering plants perfume the desert gale.
Through the vile thorn the tender myrtle twines.
(*Liberty*, I, 168-70)

The concluding couplet of the second section is the brief equivalent of a more specific passage of six lines:

Hence drooping art almost to nature leaves
The rude unguided year. Thin wave the gifts
Of yellow Ceres, thin the radiant blush
Of orchard reddens in the warmest ray.
To weedy wildness run, no rural wealth

² For convenience I keep the line-numbering of the Oxford Edition in quoting *The Seasons* and *Liberty*, though I quote the text of *The Seasons* as it stood in the 1730's, because I believe this gets us closer in time to the lines here discussed.

³ See *The Background of Thomson's 'Liberty,'* Rice Institute Pamphlet, XXXVIII (1951), especially chap. 2.

(Such as dictators fed) the garden pours.
Crude the wild olive flows, and foul the vine.
(*Liberty*, I, 157-63)

Somewhat more remotely, the same opposition is to be found in *Spring*. Thomson there writes of the Golden Age before the Flood:

Great Spring before
Greened all the year; and fruits and blossoms blushed
In social sweetness on the self-same bough
(*Spring*, 320-22) —

verbally close to the conclusion of the first section above. In *Spring* the ruin of the earth, in contrast to the pastoral paradise, is described in terms drawn from current theories about thunderstorms and earthquakes and in particular from the imaginative geology of Thomas Burnet's account of the Deluge,⁴ used in a way analogous to the earthquakes and volcanoes of the second section above.

One is tempted to speculate on the occasion and date of these lines. Thomson had probably worked out his plan for *Liberty* I, possibly as an independent "ruins of Rome" poem, as early as 1732.⁵ It is highly improbable that he ever planned to write such a poem in heroic couplet; if he wished to describe at length the beauties of Italy gone to waste he would be likely to set it forth in circumstantial blank verse. What we have here is a little stylistic study or sketch in which the imagery connected with the same sequence—Baia's seats, Umbria's retreats, rocks, winds, vegetation—is turned in opposite directions in contrasting couplets. The antithesis is sharpened by the use of the same rime-words in the first (seats—retreats) and the last (rise—lies) couplets of each section. If we are to have couplets, Thomson seems to say, let us see what we can do by way of balancing them and setting them off sharply. Was he involved in a discussion about blank verse and heroic couplet, and did he pen these verses by way of illustration? They are fairly copied out here, not scribbled as a rough draft, and it appears that they were not planned as part of a longer piece, but intended to stand by themselves. The special associations with *Liberty* and Dr. Birch suggest a date in the middle 1730's.

The Rice Institute

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

⁴ See Alan D. McKillop, *The Background of Thomson's 'Seasons,'* (Minneapolis, 1942), pp. 68-69, 97-104.

⁵ See his letter to lady Hertford, 10 October 1732, printed by Helen Sard Hughes, *Modern Philology*, XXV (1928), 454-57.

Transmutation in Crane's Imagery in *The Bridge*

One poetic technique in Hart Crane's work is the recurrence of imagery in slightly changed patterns, or the repetition of patterns in somewhat different imagery. This device, which as a verbal convenience I shall call transmutation, occurs often enough in *The Bridge*¹ to be considered a part of the poem's unity, and in one instance, at least, an emphasis on its theme. I refer to the much-maligned "Three Songs," which few readers can fit into the logic of the whole, but which as a section is a rather remarkable anticipation of the pattern of the last three: "Quaker Hill," "The Tunnel," and "Atlantis." This relationship can be considered after a look at some individual examples of transmutation in Crane's poem.

The recurrence of image and situation in *The Bridge* was partly deliberate, partly unconscious with Crane, as he wrote to Waldo Frank:

Are you noticing how throughout the poem motives and situations recur—under modifications of environment, etc.? The organic substances of the poem are holding a great many surprises for me.²

When one image or situation reappears, thus modified, the transmutation gains something of the tension of life—the new moment out of the past one. Moving through the bridge of present consciousness, the transmuted image has both continuity and change, familiarity and surprise, thus achieving a paradoxical kinetic poise. But this very quality is in the Bridge itself, described in the "Proem" as "silver-paced" by the sun whose unmoving movement leaves still "Some motion ever unspent in thy stride,—" When the same fusion, suggestive of time and stillness beyond time, occurs in the progress of the imagery, the thematic Bridge is organically constructed.

Crane noted one of the central transmutations of the poem—that the Bridge becomes ship, world, woman, and harp.³ These are not arbitrary shifts of the image-symbol, however, for in the "Proem" the Bridge is seen as "Vaulting the sea, the prairies' dreaming sod," its extension through water and land preparing for the joining of histories and the search by sea, and the generative force of Pocahontas as the natural world of America. Its function as harp for the harmony

¹ *The Collected Poems of Hart Crane*, ed. with an Introd. by Waldo Frank (New York, 1946).

² Letter to Waldo Frank (23 Aug. 1926), in *The Letters of Hart Crane*, ed. Brom Weber (New York, 1952), p. 275. All references to Crane's letters are to pages in this edition.

³ Letter to Waldo Frank (18 Jan. 1926), p. 232.

of the mystic vision is defined in the visual cabled shape—the “choiring strings” and the “Unfractioned idiom”—as well as the union which the sweeping lines of the Bridge invoke.

Other evidences of transmutation are in the details of the poem. For example, the frost and fog surrounding the lovers in “Harbor Dawn” becomes the snow of “Van Winkle,” as action turns from the harbored room to the space movement across America. As the frost is transmuted to the snow screen, through it flickers the

Sabbatical, unconscious smile
My mother almost brought me once from church.

This nearly visionary, lost smile, like Cathay or Atlantis, becomes the evanescent truth searched for in farther distances through the poem and reappears in undercurrents of the River, glimpses of Atlantis through a screen of dust and steel, and the last antiphonal whispers of Cathay. The childhood garter snakes and the launched paper monoplanes in “Van Winkle” become the time-serpent and space-eagle of later sections, as well as the aircraft of “Cape Hatteras.” As the snakes (symbol of time in the poem) are struck from the ash heap by the boy in “Van Winkle,” they flash tongues “as clean as fire.” These blend into the fire of “red fangs / And splay tongues” that burn the Indian Maquokeeta in “The Dance.” He is specifically called “snake,” and from “pure serpent, Time itself,” changes in apotheosis to timeless freedom, like a meteor or star. The lovers of “Harbor Dawn” reappear as Pocahontas and Maquokeeta in “The Dance.” As Pocahontas “is the torrent and the singing tree,” so it was said of the awakening women: “a forest shudders in your hair.” The time-nature marriage (Maquokeeta and Pocahontas) in “The Dance” and man’s union with nature on what Crane called “the pure mythical and smoky soil”⁴ of Indian culture has a wholeness, an acceptance of both physical and spiritual, whose primitive life-force is a transmutation of the more submerged nature-spirit of “The River.” There both gods and Pocahontas (the body-life of the land) are held down by an iron age, under the stream of train passengers that blend into the flow of pioneers and all in the flow of the great river which is time. Yet the river holds a deeper force, a “jungle grace” (“O quarrying passion, undertowed sunlight”) that will reach its mystic end in the silent depths of the sea. As the Indian destiny ends in isolation and near extinction on the stones of mesa sands (recalling

⁴ Letter to Otto H. Kahn (12 Sept. 1927), p. 307.

the backyard cinder pile in "Van Winkle"), the next blend is into the stony nuggets of gold which man searches for rather than the fulfillment of the natural world of Pocahontas. As nature symbol, Pocahontas is united with the mother of "Indiana," and the sea-going Larry with the derelict sailor of "Cutty Sark" ("I can't live on land"). In the bar, the mechanical jingle of "Stamboul Nights," with its line of "O Stamboul Rose," fuses in the drinker's mind with "coral Queen," and finally in the coral depths of the sea, with "Atlantis Rose," a theme which is the "transmuted voice," as Crane himself said, "of the nickel-slot pianola."⁵ The song is carried to the close of the poem into the symphonic music of the mystical harp-like Bridge and the flowering center of eternity.

The instance of transmutation most important to the total unity of *The Bridge*, however, is that of "Three Songs" and the last sections of the poem. Mr. John R. Willingham's article in *American Literature*, "'Three Songs' of Hart Crane's *The Bridge*,"⁶ does present a summary of the unity of the songs. He sees these short poems as a development of the female principle in several kinds of love, and although different in a few details, my interpretation of the songs themselves is essentially the same. It is my purpose to extend this demonstration of their unity by showing their transmutation in the last sections of the poem: the failure and death of Eve in "Southern Cross" is transmuted to the society of "Quaker Hill"; the hell of human experience in the Magdalene of "National Winter Garden" becomes that of "The Tunnel"; and the rise to the spiritualized Mary of "Virginia" becomes the mystical vision of "Atlantis." The three songs and the three sections move in the same line from sterility and death through crude humanity and black night to the genesis of harmony and vision. "Three Songs" is the prelude of a single instrument to the full orchestration of the last poems. And Crane's comment that "Quaker Hill," the last section to be added to *The Bridge*, was not important in itself but as an "accent,"⁷ indicates that he realized the possibility of intensifying the theme by completing the rounded pattern.

The "Three Songs" are about three women—Eve, Magdalene, and Mary—but all fuse into "woman," or the female principle whose body repeats the Pocahontas symbolism of earlier sections. The introductory

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *American Literature*, xxvii (March 1955), 62-68.

⁷ Letter to Caresse Crosby (26 Dec. 1929), p. 347.

quotation simply names the two cities, Sestos and Abydos, in which lived the lovers Hero and Leander, divided by the Hellespont. The problem is to join them. The first song, "Southern Cross," is the yearning for the woman (Eve, Magdalene, or Mary?), and the defeat of yearning. The first hope is for a cool, unphysical ideal, as the Southern Cross takes night separate from the violent "vaporous scars," the "slowly smoldering fire," of the lower heavens. But that yearning is defeated in the presence of Eve, fallen from Eden and the symbol of plain mortality, death that is the unrelieved burden of the flesh. As mortality, Eve becomes Medusa, turning seed and spawn to stony death ("lithic trillions"); and the Southern Cross, a phantom height, drops below the dawn. There is nothing physical in this woman-figure. She is homeless, grieving, serpent-ridden—a phantom like the Cross and a denial of life.

To compare with the sterility and death of "Southern Cross," the transmuted form begins with the disillusioned, suburban Quaker Hill, a society conceived in idealistic hope but sunk to mediocrity. The introductory quotations, Isadora Duncan's "no ideals have ever been fully successful" and Emily Dickinson's lines on autumn, are motifs for the falling-off of perfection and life. As the wash of water in "Southern Cross" gave only the wraith of Eve, out of all the dreams of the Promised Land, here in Quaker Hill are only empty windows (of both hotel and people), "cancelled reservations," resignation to cheapness and vulgarity. The human desolation is for the poet-speaker "the curse of sundered parentage" (the separation of White and Indian cultures and the attendant loss of primitive serenity that Crane developed in "The Dance"), a falling-off of perfection, like the gardenless, death-giving Eve. The news of "birthright by blackmail" implies that the darkness and tragedy of mortal existence, the commitment to the flesh, must be fulfilled. Here "Quaker Hill" goes farther than "Southern Cross" and suggests a transition to the next stage. To gain any new destiny, we must drop from the high hawk's view (the ideal) to see and love the earth more humbly with a "worm's eye" (the actual destiny). Close to the earth, to the flesh, to mortality, accepting mortal defeat and singing even with the mortal "sheaf of dust" upon the tongue, we take it to the Gate of entry to other realizations, which in the epigraph to "The Tunnel" becomes Blake's "Gates of Wrath." In the paradox of life which rejoices even in loss, despair, and death, a song "transmuting silence" with a note of pain, the heart is broken and saved at the same time, love shielded

from despair by patience even while the end is foreseen. The falling away of ideals and perfection is imaged again in the autumn leaves that "break off,/ descend—/ descend—" Both "Southern Cross" and "Quaker Hill" close with a realization of emptiness.

"National Winter Garden" and "The Tunnel" show human life at its crudest, its most starkly physical and degraded. As Crane said of "The Tunnel," "It's rather ghastly, almost surgery."⁸ But the sterile sheaf of dust which symbolized the death of the previous section must be changed to life which is realized only through submission to physical reality, as even the force of generation through man's sexual nature is begun in Magdalene, the woman of "National Winter Garden." She is crudely, violently physical and all lust. The tom-toms and turquoise snake rings recall Pocahontas, but this is a caricature of the nature goddess, and all but the flesh escapes her. In the empty trapeze of her flesh alone there may be no possibility of soaring life. But even in this woman there is something of the whole, and in the very fact of the creative force implicit in her being, she impels toward life. Even in her burlesque of nature, there is an involvement in the totality of life. Through the recognition of the whole can come recreation, "bone by infant bone," through the human commitment to the flesh. As Crane wrote about "Faustus and Helen" (a poem anticipating many of the themes of *The Bridge*), "the creator and the eternal destroyer dance arm in arm."⁹ Here is isolated the lowest common denominator of life. The mortality or death that Eve brought into the world is a mark of the human dilemma, but it is to be conquered by the life that is impelled by the continual forces of generation. In this light, the title of the song has dual connotations: the death of winter, but winter as a garden where life is enclosed though not yet flowering.

In the mechanical, material world of "The Tunnel," the protagonist again goes through hell in order to reach paradise. The theme is stated in the quotation from Blake:

To Find the Western path
Right thro' the Gates of Wrath.

From Times Square and Columbus Circle, movement of the "hiving swarms" goes by night to the subway where, underground,

⁸ Letter to Waldo Frank (23 Aug. 1926), p. 274.

⁹ Letter to Waldo Frank (7 Feb. 1923), p. 121.

The phonographs of hades in the brain
Are tunnels that re-wind themselves,

with nightmare grind of scenes chaotic, and humanity bleared with death. But even as the elemental creative force in Magdalene could "Lug us back lifeward—bone by infant bone," the protagonist of the Tunnel's grave rises to the harbor and the Bridge out of the subway

like Lazarus, to feel the slope,
The sod and billow breaking,—lifting ground.

Here, too, the lines anticipate the following movement. The leap of faith and imagination is prepared for in

—A sound of waters bending astride the sky
Unceasing with some Word that will not die . . . !

The last poems to be related are "Virginia" and "Atlantis." In both, the imagination rises through love to a mystical theme. In "Virginia"—girl, Pocahontas, the Virgin Mary—the action moves upward, even as Crane called the poem, "virgin in process of 'being built.'" ¹⁰ From the crude dance-hall girl in "National Winter Garden," the action has turned to Mary, the girl that someone waits for after work on a rainy Saturday noon. Wish, separation, and doubt also correspond to the motif of yearning in "Southern Cross." But here the girl is glorified with reality in the second stanza, "blue-eyed Mary with the claret scarf," and higher images of bells and pigeons lift the eyes. Gayety and assurance sparkle in this stanza, and doubtless the figs and oysters have garden and sexual references. Finally, out of reality and over the spring flowers in the street scene, she is shown leaning out of the tower, like a medieval painting or an image of the golden-haired Blessed Damozel at the gold bar of heaven. Described through love and beauty, she is given a clear spirituality: "Cathedral Mary,/ shine!" In "Three Songs," woman rises from Eve in the dark waters, to Magdalene in the dance hall, to Mary shining high in the flowers. But Mary is real, not a wraith like the figure of Eve.

In "Atlantis" the final mystic vision of *The Bridge* is invoked, the light and harmony more brilliantly embodied because of the Tunnel's demonic night (as the sun at the close of "Virginia" is brighter because of the smoky dance and the morning rain). In the first six stanzas of "Atlantis," the physical bridge is most immediate in the imagery; in the last six stanzas the imaged form is transmuted into the meaning

¹⁰ Letter to Waldo Frank (12 Aug. 1926), p. 272.

of the symbol, so that the suggestive arc, union, and harmony of the Bridge are more nearly in view than the physical form. Love as harmony, or music, is the principle of the system. In its musical pattern the Bridge forms "One arc synoptic of all tides below." But even in the realization of the mystic beauty, memories of the way that led through the dance hall and the subway are contained in the "cypher-script of time" in which the traveller,

through smoking pyres of love and death,
Searches the timeless laugh of mythic spears . . .

or the eternal rejoicing out of death through the pyres and spears which recall the mythic destruction of Maquokeeta and the eternity gained thereby. The human paradox of search that contains defeat, life that contains destruction, is recalled through Tyre and Troy, Jason and Aeolus. But from the ominous capes the Bridge rises, "lifting night to cycloramic crest/ Of deepest day—" and translating time into the union of many in one, the psalm of Cathay.

The symbolic Bridge rises out of the physical image as we move back across the continent to surmount and include both space and time, where eyes must "stammer through the pangs of dust and steel." Vision is regained and made whole by the physical sky (like the Bridge),

the circular, indubitable frieze
Of heaven's meditation, yoking wave
To kneeling wave.

The "steeled Cognizance" of the Bridge—its meaning and its form—holds "In single chrysalis the many twain." Generation and union are suggested in the image of the chrysalis and in the bridge as "the stitch and stallion glow" of stars. Again, as a ship it moves on the voyage, and its "intrinsic Myth"—spiritual vision through total life—is time-borne and body-borne "Through the bright drench and fabric of our veins." In all the land oppositions are joined, as tears "sustain" and life revolving through birth and harvest is a "sweet torment." The Bridge is river-throated (in time and the physical world), but out of it is the ascent of the eternal winged Deity. The culmination of the mystic vision is the ineffable white flower, here called Anemone but corresponding to Dante's great white rose, heaven's still center. The flower petals of light "spend the suns about us," as Mary in the May flowers let down her golden hair, shining in the "way-up" tower.

The last sections of *The Bridge* develop from the single movement of "Three Songs," but they are more than a simple recapitulation of the theme in other language. The "Songs" trace only the sexual motif, while the following poems embody that element in its larger context: the whole being of man as he wars through time to find some eternal order. That such a spiritual vision might be best accomplished through the whole reality of life, centering in its complete body and its creative force, is suggested by these poems.

Many have justly criticized *The Bridge* as a "Myth of America" for its chaotic historical and chronological sense and for the apparent lack of continuity between several of its sections. Yet it is fair to look again at the poem with a little more of Crane's eye. In the first place, he considered his poem symphonic, a "mystical synthesis" of America in which history, fact, and location "all have to be transfigured into abstract form. . . ." ¹¹ It was not to be a narrative epic which would proceed in historical sequence but an evolution in which idea and motif would in recurrence construct the imaginative body of the poem as an "organic panorama." ¹² Thus one might dare to say that *The Bridge* is not the Myth of America in an historical sense at all, but a construction and ritual celebration of the spiritual consciousness and creative force possible to America. Because present and past are often simultaneous and chronology distorted (as in a Faulkner novel), *The Bridge* must rely on a psychological order that is more intuitive, emotional, and mystical than rational.

A further consideration, then, is that Crane's poetic technique used not the ordinary historical or dialectic logic, but an organic principle which he called "the logic of metaphor," or "the dynamics of metaphor." ¹³ Crane's use of words like *organic* and *dynamic* in his discussions of his poetic intentions suggests that form is to be found most naturally in growth and movement. One crucial thing here is that the sensibility of the reader is required to fuse the relationships of the metaphor as it evolves. The poem is not given to the reader, but the reader helps to create it. Thus the technique demands something of the generative quality of life itself. In a larger sense than the individual metaphor, this organic principle is exactly illustrated by trans-

¹¹ Letter to Gorham Munson (18 Feb. 1923), pp. 124-125. See also Letter to Waldo Frank (18 Jan. 1926), pp. 232-233.

¹² Letter to Otto H. Kahn (12 Sept. 1927), p. 305.

¹³ "General Aims and Theories," in Philip Horton, *Hart Crane* (New York, 1937), pp. 323-328. See also Crane's letter to Harriet Monroe in *Poetry*, xxix, 36-38.

mutations in imagery. As one form blends into another, a kind of generation goes on within the poem, a cycle of life that repeats but is never exactly the same. The reader participates in its psychological movement, its ritual creation. Some of the urgency we feel in Crane's poetry is perhaps the sense we have of growth in the poem itself, and the logic we can recognize is an imaginative progression through pattern and image.

Transmutation of imagery is one organic technique in *The Bridge*. The few examples which have been shown here may indicate that Crane did attempt some unity out of chaos, and through the very form of life itself. The test is that individual elements like "Three Songs" are complete when placed in their setting, no longer erratic and incidental to the poem. They are actually liberated in meaning when, paradoxically, they are confined to the cycles of transmutation which help to make up the whole symphony of *The Bridge*.

University of Nebraska

BERNICE SLOTE

Santayana and Literary Tradition

The following letter was sent to the present writer by George Santayana on September 1, 1949.¹ It was an answer to a series of questions on his literary relationships with T. S. Eliot. Its substance is interesting from the standpoint of its apparent disavowal of Eliot's judgment that the great artist, "consciously or unconsciously," has "a sense of tradition," that is, an awareness or an intuition into the "problem of order." Santayana, at least as I read his letter, denies the need of any devotion to "a common inheritance and common cause" of artistic inspiration. From his reference to Robert Bridges' evaluation of Shakespeare, one gathers that the playwright did not "surrender and sacrifice himself in order to obtain his unique position" in literature.² Rather Santayana traces the vigor and the originality of the latter's genius to the tastes fostered by "the Renaissance." To extend the implications of this conviction, one can logically

¹ It is not included in the recent collection, *The Letters of George Santayana*, ed. Daniel Cory (New York, 1955).

² "The Function of Criticism," *Essays in Modern Literary Criticism*, ed. Ray B. West (New York, 1952), pp. 137-38.

assume that he would scoff at Eliot's philosophical speculations on art, perhaps accusing him of an unwarranted imposition of value upon an imaginative product *sui generis*. This is not a harsh indictment if one remembers Santayana's caveat upon the origins of human attitudes and usages: "No true appreciation of anything is possible without a sense of its *naturalness*, of the innocent necessity by which it assumed its special and perhaps extraordinary form."³ Certainly this statement shares little in common with Eliot's view of tradition.

And perhaps on the same grounds one finds the philosopher almost unalterably opposed to his former pupil's interpretation of the function of criticism as "the elucidation of works of art and the correction of taste."⁴ He refuses to arrogate to himself any superior "endowment of the psyche" or any monopoly on aesthetic judgment: "I have personal tastes like everyone else; but I assign no *authority* to them for being mine." Such modesty, in these dogmatic times, is indeed refreshing, regardless of whether one agrees with it entirely. At any rate, he implicitly warns against the modern tendency of affiliating one's critical principles with the dogma of schools—and such we may classify Eliot's dictatorship in the academic world.

The letter follows. May its deft sallies of wit speak their own persuasion:

Dear Mr Stein

When you ask what my position is in regard to literary criticism you seem to be thinking of the set of contemporary critics with which I agree; whether I agree or disagree, for instance, with T. S. Eliot, who at one time was a pupil of mine. Now I agree in general with his *tastes* in literature; just as I disagreed radically with the *taste* of the admirers of Browning; but I don't agree in taste at all with Ezra Pound, whom Eliot once thought the 'best of workmen,' quoting Dante about the most artificial of Provençal poets. As to being a perfect *workman*, I remember the judgment of my friend Robert Bridges on Shakespeare: 'He is the greatest of poets and the greatest of dramatists, but he is not an artist,' i.e. he did not take pains to exclude everything low or improper from the plays, but he wrote professionally to please the pit. I myself am not distressed at the bawdy jokes in Shakespeare; they are part of the fun of human life, and he was pouring out his riches from a cornucopia, carrots [*sic*] and onions with the lilies and violets. It was the Renaissance—matters of taste are matters of sympathy: people who have no taste except for onions sin from ignorance and insensibility, not from liking onions, which is not a sin. I remember a pilot in the Rhone who when asked what he would like for dinner said bread and an onion, and when asked if he

³ *The Genteel Tradition at Bay* (New York, 1931), p. 73.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

wouldn't like a steak or chop besides, said, No, thank you. He did not pretend to criticize the French cuisine but he was a true lover of bread and onions. I do not share his tastes, but I like *him*.

This touches a different point, my position as to the place of literature and the plastic arts and my criticism of them. This is a broad philosophical and moral question. Religion may decide it for us dogmatically if we are believers; the place of literature and the arts and of everything would be to save men's souls or to serve the Church or to strengthen morality, or whatever you said was the highest good. Now in morals I am not a dogmatist. I think the centre and criterion for moral preference is, in each case, the endowment of the psyche, and its capacities. You must do seriously what Socrates did perhaps ironically, ask your pupil to give *his* answer, and then question him further to see if he knows his own mind or not. Socrates, up his sleeve, had a narrow dogmatic theory of morals, the right code for an old-fashioned Greek city, not the dissolute changing ideals of Athens in his day. But the structure of society and the balance of human faculties change from age to age and from place to place; so that while I follow Socrates in making the psyche, or primal Will in oneself, the source and judge of morality then and for that kind of psyche (of course public morality has to be social, but that is not final, only conventional for the individual), I depart decidedly from his parochialism, though it has the same homely 'piety' in it as the Rhone pilot's fidelity to raw onions.

Does this make you see what my position is in literary criticism? I have personal tastes like everyone else; but I assign no *authority* to them for being mine. It is simply impossible and would be artificial and ridiculous for people to insist on everyone's having the same tastes. And I am a naturalist in philosophy, not assigning an *absolute authority* to any particular form of morals or government, none, for instance, to 'democracy.'

Yours sincerely,

G. Santayana

Washington and Jefferson College

WILLIAM BYSSHE STEIN

Les *Foresteries* de Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaie et les productions pastorales de la Pléiade

La poésie pastorale en France ne devient importante qu'à partir de 1560 avec Ronsard, qui, non seulement rend le genre populaire, mais en influence l'évolution. Mia Gerhardt, dans son étude sur la pastorale, établit l'importance du rôle joué par ce dernier "qui a détourné le genre de l'inspiration amoureuse et personnelle des Poitevins et l'a orienté vers la poésie de cour et d'apparat . . . vers les débuts mêmes

de la pastorale renaissante en France, vers Marot et Scève qui l'ont inaugurée par des églogues de circonstance. . . ."¹ Les églogues de Ronsard ne sont donc pas, à proprement parler, dans le goût des premières productions de la Pléiade. Lorsqu'en 1553, dans son "Elégie à Jean de la Péruse," il résume les genres *découverts* et chantés par les poètes de la nouvelle école, l'églogue (il passe sous silence l'églogue marotique) n'existe pas encore, mais elle figure au programme :

Peut estre apres, que Dieu nous donnera
Quelque hardi, qui brave sonnera
De longue aleine un poëme heroique,
Quelque autre apres la chanson bucolique.²

Laumonier, commentant ce passage, note que le chant bucolique "devait être restauré à la fois par Baïf, Ronsard et Belleau."³

Ni Ronsard ni Belleau n' "inventent" l'églogue de la Pléiade. D'après Chamard, Alice Hulubei, et Augé-Chiquet,⁴ l'honneur revient à Baïf. Or, en 1555, le jeune Vauquelin de la Fresnaie publie à Poitiers un recueil de poésies pastorales qui, tant par le fond que par la forme, peuvent revendiquer une place parmi les productions de la Pléiade: *Les Deux Premiers Livres des Foresteries*.⁵ A qui donc attribuer les premières églogues françaises de la Pléiade? Sainte-Marthe fait, à la même époque, des traductions d'églogues, Tahureau et Betholaud écrivent aussi des églogues qui ne nous sont pas parvenues.⁶ Parmi tous ces "précurseurs," qui a donné le signal? Vauquelin? Baïf? Ce dernier est initié, au moins dès 1550, à la pastorale grecque. Mais, pendant son séjour à Poitiers (1554-1555), il n'aurait composé, d'après A. Hulubei et Augé-Chiquet, que quatre églogues.⁷ Les autres furent écrites à Paris, entre 1557 et 1560. Pourquoi Baïf, qui tenait si jalousement, comme ses contemporains, à ce titre de précurseur, s'est-il laissé devancer par son cadet, qui, en 1555, publie deux livres de 24 poèmes? Serait-ce tout simplement

¹ Mia I. Gerhardt, *La Pastorale, Essai d'analyse littéraire* (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1950), p. 233.

² Ed. Laumonier, v, pp. 263-264.

³ *Id.*, v, note 4, p. 263.

⁴ H. Chamard, *Histoire de la Pléiade* (Paris, Didier), III, 43; A. Hulubei, *L'Eglogue en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, Droz, 1938), pp. 342-343, 367-368; M. Augé-Chiquet, *La Vie, les idées et l'œuvre de Jean-Antoine de Baïf* (Paris, Hachette, 1909), p. 71.

⁵ Cf. notre édition, Genève, Droz, 1956 (Textes Littéraires Français); c'est à cette édition que nous renverrons le lecteur.

⁶ A. Hulubei, *op. cit.*, pp. 364-367.

⁷ Cf. *supra*, note 4.

qu'il n'en possédait pas en nombre suffisant? Que ce soit à Vauquelin, à Baïf, ou à l'un de leurs amis que revienne la priorité, la question importe peu. Nous voulions simplement souligner qu'elle ne revient pas à Baïf à l'exclusion de tout autre. Ce qu'il faut retenir, c'est que les premières tentatives de poésie pastorale nous viennent de Poitiers et que les *Foresteries* méritent une place au moins égale à celle des églogues de Baïf dans le développement de la pastorale de la Pléiade.

Vauquelin et ses amis fondent de grands espoirs sur ce recueil. Il paraît, accompagné de poèmes laudatifs composés par ses amis qui voient en lui le Virgile, le Théocrite français. Ce "premier Foret-tiseur" est "ja dans l'autel de l'Ascrean."⁸ Malheureusement, l'ouvrage n'a pas le succès escompté. S'il faut en croire ce que nous en dit Vauquelin en 1560,⁹ la publication en fut prématurée. L'églogue n'était pas encore à la mode :

Ronsard, qui n'a laissé d'outil qui n'ait touché
En tout genre de chants, a depuis embouché
Ce flageol bravement: & dans sa Bergerie
Belleau fait aux Seigneurs quitter la Seigneurie.
Mais pour avoir cueilli mes fruits hors de saison,
Ils sont depuis restez flestris en la maison: ¹⁰

Le succès du recueil étant limité, l'on peut assumer que son influence sur les contemporains fut moindre. Ronsard se détourne de ce genre de pastorale (qui est aussi celui de Baïf), Belleau fait œuvre à part. Cependant, tous trois, Ronsard, Belleau et Baïf ont consulté les *Foresteries* et leur ont fait quelques emprunts.

Bien que la conception des églogues de Ronsard soit toute différente, il existe, entre les églogues des deux poètes, des ressemblances. D'une part, tous deux se mettent en scène sous des pseudonymes de bergers, entourés de leurs amis respectifs, engagés dans des combats littéraires. Il se dégage de leurs églogues la même atmosphère artificielle propre à ce genre. Cependant, tandis que chez Vauquelin les discussions sont, soit amoureuses, soit littéraires, chez Ronsard, elles ne servent, la plupart du temps, qu'à déguiser la relation d'événements réels. D'autre part, les auteurs puisent abondamment aux mêmes sources: Virgile, Théocrite, Sannazar. Par exemple, Bellot compare Perrot (Ronsard) à

⁸ *Foresteries*, p. 163.

⁹ In l'idillie 66 qui, devant servir de préface à la deuxième édition projetée des *Foresteries*, fut composée en 1560.

¹⁰ *Œuvres diverses en prose et en vers de Jean Vauquelin, Sieur de la Fresnaie*, éd. Julien Travers (Caen, 1872), *Idillies*, II, 66, p. 613.

Un toreau qui du pied pousse l'arene au vent.¹¹

Sauvaget (Vauquelin) déclare devoir à Phébus

. . . un fauve Torelet,
Qui bondissant écarte la poudriere.¹²

Ils imitent tous deux Virgile :

. . . pascite taurum
jam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat arenam.¹³

D'autres vers du poète latin,

malle pati tenerisque meos incidere Amores
arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, Amores,¹⁴

se retrouvent deux fois chez Vauquelin, dans sa préface: ". . . vous amusant à lire les vers gravés à fine force aus écorces des tendres Freneteaux, qui croisants feront croître vôtre nom en mes vers,"¹⁵ et ailleurs :

Il n'est arbreau en ce bocage
Où ne soit gravé mon renom,
Qui croissants feront témoignage
De noz amours & de mon nom: ¹⁶

Dans son " Eclogue du Thier " (1559), Ronsard se souvient des mêmes vers :

De sur deux chéneteaux, hyër à toute force
AVANSON je gravé avecques un poinson.
Les deux chesnes croistront, et la nouvelle escorce
Portera jusqu'au Ciel le nom de d'AVENSON.¹⁷

Remarquons que Ronsard et Vauquelin omettent tous deux le " malle pati " de Virgile. D'autres ressemblances ne sont dues qu'à des lieux communs, par exemple :

Et toi, Musette, à qui presque j'avois
Par sept conduis donné la mesme voix,
Qu'à son flageol avoit donné Tityre: ¹⁸

et

Maintenant donc au chalumeau facile

¹¹ " Chant pastoral " de 1559, éd. Laumonier, ix, p. 92.

¹² *Foresteries*, I, vi, 169, p. 46.

¹³ *Egl.*, III, 86-87.

¹⁴ *Egl.*, x, 53-54.

¹⁵ *Foresteries*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁶ *Id.*, I, iii, 126-129, p. 24.

¹⁷ Ed. Laumonier, x, p. 63.

¹⁸ " Chant pastoral," éd. Laumonier, ix, p. 178.

De sept tuias aportés de Sicile,
Je fluterai. . . .¹⁹

Mais il en est certaines, moins banales: on trouve, chez Vauquelin, le thème du cerf apprivoisé²⁰ emprunté à Sannazar; Ronsard, beaucoup plus tard, le reprend, dans une description mignarde d'une quarantaine de vers.²¹ Est-ce en lisant les *Foresteries* que Ronsard aurait songé à ce passage de Sannazar? Ce n'est pas impossible. En fait, dans un autre passage, Ronsard imite Vauquelin, discrètement mais directement:

Bellot.

Dy moy quelle herbe fait les hommes invisibles,
Mise desur la langue, avant que desjeuner,
De qui Janne faisoit des choses impossibles:
Tu me seras un Dieu, si la peux deviner.

Perrot.

Mais devine toymesme, et tu seras Prophete
Le plus grand des pasteurs, de quelle herbe est changé
Le cœur d'une pucelle, et de cruelle est faicte
Plus douce à son amy, quand elle en a mangé?

Bellin.

Il ne faut point entrer en si longue dispute,
Mon Bellot, mon amy, prens de moy ceste flute.²²

M. Laumonier, dans son édition, donne en note, comme source des deux quatrains de Ronsard, les vers de Virgile où, dit-il, "les bergers se posent entre eux des énigmes analogues; après quoi l'arbitre Palémon les arrête, comme le fait ici Bellin; 'Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites.'" ²³ En fait, l'idée d'une herbe magique qui a le pouvoir de rendre les hommes invisibles apparaît dans une prose de Sannazar:

... Et une pierre contre les nuysans regardz des yeux empoysonnez d'envie. Et n'oublia (certes) celle estant enveloppée avec une certaine herbe & aucunes paroles de magicque, rend invisible celuy qui la porte, tellement qu'il peult, quand bon luy semble, aller en toutes places, & faire entièrement sa volonté sans crainte d'estre empesché d'homme qui vive.²⁴

¹⁹ *Foresteries*, I, vi, 17, p. 38.

²⁰ *Id.*, I, iii, 18-55, pp. 19-21.

²¹ "Bergerie . . .," éd. Laumonier, XIII, 104-142, pp. 82-83.

²² "Eclogue du Thier," éd. Laumonier, X, 233-242, p. 64.

²³ *Id.*, X, p. 64, note 3.

²⁴ *L'Arcadie . . . mise d'Italien en François par Jehan Martin . . .* (Paris, Michel de Vascosan et Gilles Corrozet, 1544), p. 61.

Cependant, chez ce dernier, il s'agit non pas d'un chant amébée, mais d'une prose. Or les deux devinettes de Virgile ne ressemblent en rien à celles de Ronsard.²⁵ Vauquelin, au contraire, dans une églogue où deux bergers sont engagés dans un combat littéraire en chants amébées devant un arbitre, combine les devinettes de Virgile et le passage de Sannazar. Ronsard s'est donc bien adressé au passage suivant de Vauquelin :

Fleuriot.

Di moi, quelle herbe (et soi mon Apollon)
L'aïant au chef, peut garder de médire
Le médisant, qui médiroit selon
Qu'une cholère en sa rage desire?

Sauvaget.

Dis moi, quell' pierre invisible feroit
(Ainsi sois tu ma Myrtine & ma vie)
Quand à mi-nuit voir s'amie on voudroit
D'un dous soupir se mouvoir endormie? ²⁶

En effet, si l'on accepte assez facilement que Vauquelin et Ronsard empruntent tous deux à Virgile l'idée d'introduire des devinettes dans les chants amébées, il est plus difficile d'attribuer à un goût commun ou à une coïncidence le fait qu'ils puisent tous deux dans le même passage en prose le sujet de leurs devinettes. Il ne faudrait perdre de vue, cependant, que ces détails ne révèlent en somme que l'étendue des connaissances de Ronsard et l'application qu'il apportait à l'étude de tout genre qu'il entreprenait de suivre. Il n'a pas dédaigné non plus Baïf, à qui il a fait quelques emprunts, qu'une comparaison attentive de leurs textes établira facilement.

Quant à Belleau, sa *Bergerie* ressemble bien peu aux *Foresteries*, malgré les quelques églogues faites sur le modèle des bucoliques classiques. Pour lui, l'observation et la peinture détaillée de la nature passent au premier plan. Sa conception de la pastorale est donc toute différente et de celle de Ronsard et de celle de Vauquelin. Néanmoins, il fait quelques emprunts à ce dernier: il lui doit le cadre en vers et en prose que l'auteur des *Foresteries* avait lui-même pris à Sannazar, sa conception d'un ouvrage très varié, et quelques détails. Dès 1560, Vauquelin, au courant du projet de Belleau, revendique l'honneur d'avoir le premier mêlé prose et vers :

²⁵ *Egl.*, III, 104 et suiv.: *Daphn.* Dic quibus in terris, et eris mihi magnus Apollo, / tris pateat caeli spatium non amplius ulnas. / *Men.* Dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum / nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto.

²⁶ *Foresteries*, I, vi, 223-230, p. 49.

. . . Et si, bien dire j'ose
Que des premiers aux vers j'avois meslé la prose.²⁷

Belleau, cinq ans plus tard, réclame à son tour la priorité "pour la diversité et mélange des inventions rustiques, et nouvelle façon d'écrire, qui n'a encores esté pratiquée ny connue en nostre France,"²⁸ bien qu'il connaisse les *Foresteries*. Pour ce qui est des imitations de détails, il n'y en a qu'une dans l'édition de 1565, Doris Delacourcelle la relève dans son édition.²⁹ Il s'agit d'une longue prose³⁰ dans laquelle Belleau a fondu deux passages en vers de Vauquelin³¹ avec un passage en prose de l'*Arcadie* de Sannazar que l'auteur des *Foresteries* imite en partie.³² Dans la deuxième édition de la *Bergerie* (1572),³³ on relève une trentaine de vers qui suivent d'assez près la description du "jardin amoureux" de la dixième foresterie de Vauquelin,³⁴ description empruntée à l'Arioste. Belleau a combiné ces quelques vers de Vauquelin avec un passage en vers tiré d'une autre foresterie³⁵ qui suit Sannazar. Certains détails communs à Belleau et à Vauquelin qui ne se retrouvent ni chez l'Arioste ni chez Sannazar permettent d'affirmer que Belleau a consulté Vauquelin.

Les églogues de Vauquelin et celles de Baïf se ressemblent beaucoup : même conception simple et littérale de l'églogue théocritienne, même mélange de fraîcheur et d'artifice. Si nous laissons de côté les ressemblances dues à des sources communes, l'on trouve très peu d'imitations de détail. Cependant, l'églogue VI de Baïf, "les Amoureux" (qui serait de 1554), présente un passage dont la similitude avec les vers 191-200 de la foresterie VI ne saurait être attribuée à une coïncidence. Écoutons Baïf :

Je ne souhette paistre en une large plaine
Mille troupeaux de bœufs et de bestes à laine:
Mais si je tenoy, Francine entre mes bras,
Pour tous les biens de Rois je ne ferois un pas.³⁶

et Vauquelin :

²⁷ Cf. *supra* notes 9 et 10.

²⁸ Remy Belleau, *La Bergerie*, éd. D. Delacourcelle (Genève, 1954), p. 26.

²⁹ *Id.*, p. 56, note 1.

³⁰ *Id.*, pp. 56-57.

³¹ *Foresteries*, II, v, vers 29-40, 45-72, pp. 132-134.

³² *L'Arcadie*, prose V, éd. Carrara, p. 39.

³³ Ed. Marty-Laveaux, t. I, pp. 223-224.

³⁴ *Foresteries*, I, x, 43 et suiv. pp. 69 et suiv.

³⁵ *Id.*, I, iii, 9-16, pp. 18-19.

³⁶ *Egl.*, III, éd. Marty-Laveaux, t. III, p. 37.

Fleuriot.

En Auge avoir aux pâtis mille beus
Ne m'agré' tant, que mille petis veus,
Que me souhaite & m'amie & sa trope.

Sauvaget.

Je ne veu point un regne de Pelope,
Un or jaunâtre, ou devancer le vent,
Mais avec toi, Myrtine être souvent.

Fleuriot.

Ma Clearite, un jour si je t'avoie,
Plus qu'un Palais, les Forests j'aimeroie.

Sauvaget.

Si j'ai Myrtine, ha fi de tous les bois,
Dans les Palais vivrai comme les Rois.⁴⁷

Les vers de Vauquelin *Je ne veu point . . . à . . . souvent* étant paraphrasés de Théocrite—qui ne parle pas de *bœufs*—et l'enchaînement des idées étant logique: "règne de Pélope," "Palais," "Rois," alors que chez Baïf l'association de "mille troupeaux de bœufs" et de "biens de Rois" semble être accidentelle, nous sommes portés à croire que Baïf a imité Vauquelin: que le passage en question ait été écrit avant la publication des *Foresteries*, pour être remanié par la suite, ou que la pièce ait été composée après 1555, Baïf a consulté les *Foresteries*. On relèvera aussi une imitation de détail dans l'églogue VII de Baïf, postérieure à 1555. Les vers

Sandrine m'aime bien: Quand je passe aupres d'elle,
Tant loin qu'elle me voit, elle se fait plus belle.

. . .

Lisette me hayt-elle? hier comme je passe
Devant son huis, la belle (O Dieu, de quelle grace!)
Me jette un beau bouquet. . .

.

A ma gente Nymphete un Ecureuil je donne:

.

Un sansonet mignon dans une belle cage
L'autre jour lui donnay. . .⁴⁸

ressemblent beaucoup aux réparties de Fleuriot et de Sauvaget:

Fleuriot.

Je hai Nerine, encor quand on lui donne
Un écureul, ell' ne baise personne.

⁴⁷ *Foresteries*, I, vi, 191-200, p. 47.

⁴⁸ Ed. Marty-Laveaux, III, pp. 42-43.

Sauvaget.

J'aime Nerine: hier je lui présenté
Deus tourtereaus, mais je fu contenté:

. . .
O quel Dieu-Gard! ai-j' eu à matin d'elle
A l'escalier où j'ai passai la belle.³⁹

Ainsi donc si l'influence du recueil des *Foresteries* fut limitée, lorsque vint la mode de publier⁴⁰ ou de composer des églogues, Ronsard, Belleau et Baïf se souvinrent de Vauquelin.

University of California

MARC BENSIMON

Cervantes and the "Caballero Fonseca"

When the *escrutinio* of Don Quijote's library brings to light the novel *Tirante el Blanco*, Cervantes uses the occasion to criticize the author;¹ but he praises the story and mentions some of the characters in it, as follows:

Aquí está don Quirieleisón de Montalbán, valeroso caballero, y su hermano Tomás de Montalbán, y el caballero Fonseca, con la batalla que el valiente de Tirante hizo con el alano, y las agudezas de la doncella Placerdemivida, con los amores y embustes de la viuda Reposada, y la señora Emperatriz, enamorada de Hipólito, su escudero.²

The "caballero Fonseca" appears but once in the entire novel, being referred to in a single sentence: "Primerament iqué la bandera de l'Emperador, portada per un cavaller, qui era nomenat Fontseca, sobre un gran e meravellós cavall tot blanc."³ This strange anomaly was early noticed and pointed out by a succession of editors of the *Quijote*, among them Bowle, Clemencín, Cortejón, and Rodríguez Marín; but hardly any attempt has been made to explain it. Menéndez y Pelayo saw in the mention of Fonseca an example of

³⁹ *Foresteries*, I, vi, 217-220, 253-254, pp. 48, 50.

⁴⁰ Nous rappelons au lecteur que Baïf ne publia ses églogues qu'en 1573, dans ses *Œuvres en rime*.

¹ Cf. Margaret Bates, "Cervantes' Criticism of *Tirant lo Blanch*," *HR*, xxi (1953), 142-44.

² *Don Quijote*, ed. Rodríguez Marín ("Clásicos castellanos"), I, 161.

³ Joanot Martorell, *Tirant lo Blanc*, ed. Martín de Riquer (Barcelona: Editorial Selecta, 1947), p. 362.

Cervantes' "portentosa memoria,"⁴ while Riquer expresses the opinion that the author of the *Quijote* simply opened the book at random and noticed the name.⁵

An analysis of Cervantes' passage reveals it to be an artistically symmetrical structure. Its central figure, or axis, is the protagonist Tirant, who is flanked by three male characters and three female—like a coat of arms with three supporters on each side. Hipólito may be disregarded, as he is a necessary adjunct to the characterization of the Empress. Such a structure seems to be the result of an artistic compulsion, if not, indeed, a deliberate effort. The fact that Cervantes does not refer to such principal and oft-named characters as, for instance, Tirant's wife Carmesina, or his cousin Diafebus, indicates that he either did not remember the story clearly, or preferred to name some lesser lights, or both. It must be assumed, in either case, that he needed another name to complete his passage. If he had had as "portentosa memoria" as Menéndez y Pelayo believed, he could have made a much better choice of male characters than he did; while the context in which the name Fonseca appears makes it doubly unlikely that he opened the book at random.

After mentioning Fonseca, the Catalan text continues:

Aprés iqué la bandera de la divisa de l'Emperador, la qual era ab lo camper blau ab la torre de Babilònia tota d'argent, ficada una espasa dins la dita torre ab un braç tot armat qui tenia l'espasa per lo mantí ab un mot de lletres d'or qui deien: *Mia és la ventura*. Aquesta bandera era acompanyada de tots los servidors de casa d l'Emperador. Aprés d'aquesta esquadra venia lo duc de Casàndria e lo duc de Montsant, cascú ab sa esquadra, que eren venguts de Nàpols. Aprés passà lo marquès de Sant Marco de Venècia ab la sua esquadra, e après lo marquès de Montferrat. Lo marquès de Sant Jordi iqué molt abillat ab los cavalls encobertats de brocat e de seda e tota la sua gent molt en orde de totes les coses necessàries a la guerra. Aprés iqué lo marquès de Peixcara ab la sua esquadra, e lo marquès del Guast e lo marquès d'Arena. Lo marquès de Brandis, lo marquès de Prota, lo marquès de Montnegre e un germà bastard del príncep de Taràntol: cascú d'aquests iqué ab sa esquadra. Aprés de tots aquests ixqueren lo comte de Bell-lloc, lo comte de Plegamans, lo comte d'Ager, lo comte d'Aigües Vives, lo comte de Burgença, lo comte de Capaci, lo comte d'Aquino, lo comte de Benafria, lo comte Carlo de Malatesta e lo comte Jacobo de Vintimilla de Sicília; e cascú d'aquests iqué ab sa esquadra.⁶

⁴ *Orígenes de la novela* (Edición nacional; Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1943), I, 393, note 1.

⁵ Martorell, *op. cit.*, "Introducción," p. *192. Heikki Impiwaara (*Neu-philologische Mitteilungen*, xxxvii [1936], 42-45) suggests that mental association with the name of an author friend, Cristóbal de Fonseca, enabled Cervantes to recall that of the flag bearer.

⁶ Martorell, *op. cit.*, pp. 362-63.

This
plays
those
indee
on, to
to lea
look f

It a
the S
have
transl
Rique
"se e
castel
notice
also l
name
the o
are tv
provi
of la
anoth
arriv
anoth
or le
Fons
only
Span
made

Un

* C
lo B
* M
* M
dead

This enumeration of dukes, marquesses, and counts, none of whom plays a very great role in the story, includes a goodly number of all those who appear in the book,⁷ thereby acting as a sort of onomastic index. A person who had once read the novel, and who wished, later on, to find a collection of names from which to choose without having to leaf through a large part of the work, would naturally recall and look for this section of the story.

It seems to be generally assumed that Cervantes read the *Tirant* in the Spanish translation of Valladolid, 1511, although he could also have used the Catalan editions of 1490 and 1497, or the Italian translation first published in Venice in 1538 and reprinted in 1566.⁸ Riquer, in his introduction (p. *192), states that the name Fonseca "se encuentra en la penúltima línea del folio 88 verso de la traducción castellana de 1511." What he and other scholars seem not to have noticed is that, on opening the book at that place, folio 89 recto would also be exposed to view. On that page would be found the series of names, as is clear from the description given by Aguiló y Fuster of the only known copy of this translation, in which he declares that there are two columns per page and 45 lines in each column.⁹ This format provides ample room for the text quoted, even allowing for difference of language. It was in this manner, then, that Cervantes, needing another name to achieve the completion of his artistic goal, probably arrived at folio 88 verso and 89 recto—or the corresponding pages of another version—not by opening the book at random, but after a more or less short search. He may not have been aware that the name Fonseca appeared only once in the entire novel; but since it was the only surname in the series, as well as the only name with an essentially Spanish ring to it, he found that it suited his purpose and therefore made use of it.

University of Toronto

WARREN T. MCCREADY

⁷ Cf. list in Givanel Mas, "Estudio crítico de la novela caballeresca *Tirant lo Blanch*," *Archivo de investigaciones históricas*, II (1911), 490.

⁸ Martorell, *op. cit.*, "Introducción," pp. *181, *206-07.

⁹ Mariano Aguiló y Fuster, *Catálogo de obras en lengua catalana impresas desde 1474 hasta 1860* (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1923), p. 657a.

Manuscrits de Pierre Bayle

Outre un nombre considérable de lettres adressées à Pierre Bayle ou écrites de sa main, dont Emile Gigas publia, en 1890, un recueil aussi brillant que vaste,¹ la Bibliothèque Royale de Copenhague possède de cet auteur deux volumes en manuscrit qui sont—à part les brouillons de trois lettres—non seulement inédits mais encore inconnus à un tel point qu'on n'a, jusqu'ici, jamais traité de leur contenu. Comme les lettres, ces deux volumes proviennent de la riche collection de manuscrits que possédait le comte danois Otto Thott. Voici un bref compte-rendu du texte du volume côté *Thott-fonds n° 1202 in-4to*.

Haute de 21 cms et large de 16 cms $\frac{1}{2}$, la reliure en parchemin est pourvue de la légende: *Ecrits de m^r. Bayle*. Cet humaniste studieux semble se l'avoir fait fabriquer dans l'été de 1672 pour y noter les résumés de l'oeuvre de Plutarque, *Vies des hommes illustres*, dont se compose la partie principale du livre. L'historien semble s'être proposé de lire systématiquement les Vies parallèles de Plutarque pour en donner ensuite, sous une forme plus synthétisée, quelques-unes des biographies de ses célébrités grecques et romaines. Plus tard, il a continué le tableau de l'histoire de Rome basé sur les historiens romains. Le vocabulaire, les formes des noms propres et l'orthographe nous prouvent que Bayle, pour y arriver, s'est servi de la célèbre traduction faite par Amyot,² malgré la nouvelle traduction en huit volumes que l'abbé Tallemant fit paraître à partir de 1671.³

La page 3 porte en haut le titre daté:

*Abregé des vies illustres / de plutarque.
Commencé le lundy 4. Juillet 1672.*

Malgré la note écrite à gauche de celui-ci: *Ecrit par M^r. Bayle dont les reflexions sont scavantes et justes*, ces résumés sont peu intéressants en soi, parce que, grosse modo, nous avons affaire à des transcriptions de l'oeuvre de Plutarque si dépourvues d'originalité que je me borne ici à reproduire l'index ajouté à la page 2. Celui-ci,

¹ *Choix de la correspondance inédite de Pierre Bayle 1670-1706, publié d'après les originaux conservés à la Bibliothèque Royale de Copenhague*, ed. Émile Gigas (Copenhague-Paris, 1890).

² *Les vies des hommes Illustres Grecs & Romains, Comparees l'une avec l'autre par Plutarque de Charonee, Translatees de Grec en François par Jacques Amyot*, MDLVIII. 734 pages doubles.

³ *Les vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, Nouvellement traduites de Grec en François. Par M. l'Abbé Tallemant* (Paris 1671 et suiv).

compl
se pré

Thesée
Romul
Lycurg
N(uma)
Solon
V(aler)
Them

F(urib)
pericle
Alexan
Eumer
F(abi)
(daté)
Demet

Les
en ap

pompé
M. Ca
Caius
Sulla
Tullus
Ancus

Les
en 39

Aut
et le t

Pu

Abr
l'an d
le Cor

Ap
résun
pour
autre
lettre
excell
C'e

VOL. L

complété par les titres des résumés et la date qui apparaît çà et là, se présente ainsi :

Thésée p. 1-3.	pyrrhus p. 53-58.
Romulus p. 3-6.	Alcibiades p. 58-62.
Lycurgus p. 6-8.	Coriolanus p. 62-66.
N(uma) pompilienne p. 8-11.	Marcellus p. 67-71.
Solon p. 11-14.	Hannibal p. 72-77.
V(alerius) publicola p. 15-19.	Scipion L'Africain p. 78-82.
Themistocles p. 19-22.	(daté: Le Samedi 17. septembre 1672).
F(urius) Camillus p. 22-27.	philippe de Macedoine. p. 82-86.
pericles p. 28-32.	Jules César p. 86-97.
Alexandre le Grand p. 32-39.	César Auguste p. 97-104.
Eumenes p. 40-43.	M(arcus) Antonius p. 104-113.
F(abius) maximus p. 43-47.	M(arcus) Brutus p. 113-119.
(daté: Le mercredi 14 Aoust 1672).	(daté: Le 8. octobre 1672).
Demetrius p. 47-53.	Epaminondas p. 119-.

Les pages 121 à 128 formant une lacune du texte, seul l'index nous en apprend le contenu :

pompée p. 124.	Tarquinius prisens p. 162.
M. Caton. p. 133.	Servius Tullus p. 170.
Caius Marius p. 137.	Tarquin le Superbe p. 175.
Sulla p. 146.	1 ^{ere} crea(ti)on du Dictateur p. 192.
Tullus Hostilius p. 157.	des Tribuns du peuple 195.
Ancus martius p. 161.	des Consuls plebeiens p. 204-?.

Les pages 225 à 242 comprennent l'époque de la mort de Sextus en 390 jusqu'à l'an 488 u. c. :

Autre Extrait de l'histoire Rom. pr. servir de liaison entre ce q precede, et le tems de la Guerre punique.

Puis les pages 243 à 256 :

Abrégé Chronologique de / l'histoire Rom. depuis la fin de 3^e guerre punique l'an de R. 607. jusques au tems de Iules Cesar qui naquit l'an de R. 653 sous le Consulat de C. Marius pr la 6. fois et de L. Valerius Flaccus.

Après cette synthèse en date du 6 juin 1678, prennent fin ces résumés de l'histoire antique que Bayle a pu employer comme manuel pour la rédaction de son *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, entre autres. Le reste du volume a servi à Bayle de brouillon des trois lettres (dont une très longue) dont Gigas a donné une édition excellente.

C'est après une feuille blanche (pp. 257 à 258) que suivent ces

brouillons; en même temps, l'auteur recommence à neuf la pagination qui affecte, cette fois-ci, seule le recto quoique le verso soit aussi écrit. Avec la légende de la page première: *De Mr. Bayle et de sa main propre*, commence la lettre III de l'édition de Gigas (ses pages 11 à 74), adressée à son ami Vincent Minutoli, professeur de langue grecque, histoire et éloquence à Genève depuis 1675. Cette lettre longue de quatre-vingts pages (les feuilles 1 à 40) fut commencée à Lamberville le 27 septembre 1674 et, reprise plusieurs fois, terminée à Rouen le 13 novembre de la même année. Dans sa reproduction scrupuleuse et minutieuse, Gigas n'a omis que quelques citations d'Horace, par exemple p. 24 r. (Gigas, p. 48 après le mot "justaucorps"): "Mais pr reuenir a Horace ie uous prie M. de ietter les yeux sur le commencem^t de l'ode 5^e du 2. liure, et en meme tems sur les vers q suivent.*" En marge de la page 25, Bayle cite cette phrase plaisante du *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française* de Ménage: "Je trouve dans les remarques de m^r menage sur la langue Franc. ces vers de marot: L'Epousé la 1^{ere} nuit.* . . . Voici qlqs vers de Jean de melun qui, à cause de leur antiquité, pourront avoir ici leur place.* . ." Et en marge de la page 35 r. (Gigas, p. 65), Bayle renvoie au même ouvrage: "Je trouve dans m^r menage obs. sur la langue fr. ptie 2 ch. 14 deux passages sur l'usage de l'hyperbole. Le 1^{er} est de Seneque * . . . l'autre^e de Quintilien q d't entr'autres choses.* . ." Aussi à la page 66, l'édition de Gigas omet (après le mot "iours") ce passage horatien de la page 35 du manuscrit: "Je faisoit allusion à une pensée d'Horace q voici.* . ."

(L'astérisque indique la place des citations dans le texte de Bayle.)

Les pages suivantes (40 à 46) sont occupées par le brouillon de la lettre que Bayle adressa le 17 novembre 1674 à Jacques Basnage et qui porte le n° IV dans Gigas (pp. 74 à 85); vient ensuite (pp. 46 à 47) une lettre en date du 18 janvier 1675 au même destinataire mais en latin, le n° V dans l'édition de Gigas (pp. 85 à 87). Cette lettre-ci se termine par un renvoi en français: "v(oir) dans Quintilien . . . l'Orateur Julius 2 affligé d'avoir été 3 jours sans trouver l'exorde et la reponse q lui fut foite." Au-dessous de la lettre même, on lit: *Icy finissent les ecrit de Mr. Bayle*. Un bon quart de siècle après, et exactement le 28 décembre 1706, Bayle mourut: il y a de là deux cent cinquante ans. L'héritier du volume a utilisé deux des quatorze feuilles qui restaient à noter, en date du 24^e Jouillet 1717, une affaire scandaleuse qui n'a aucun rapport avec Bayle. Enfin, le lecteur trouvera entre les pages du livre deux feuilles séparées, l'une

donna
divers
troisi
notes,

Cop

The
Exil

In
days
comp
able.
his p
a hot
appea
1835.
clude
durin
to it.
long

Sin
of hi
expla
the p
by Je
day—
celebr
escap
part
speci
brate
this m
censo

1 Pa
ed. M

VOL. L

donnant le curriculum vitae de Bayle, l'autre des extraits des *Pensées diverses de M^r Bayle*, écrites toutes deux d'une autre main. Une troisième fiche raconte simplement le contenu du livre: *Remarques, notes, et reflexions de M^r Bayle. Ce manuscrit est de sa main.*

Copenhagen

LEIF NEDERGAARD

The Contribution of a Directoire Exile to a Poem of Alfred de Musset

In the summer of 1835, Alfred de Musset interrupted for a few days his work on the *Confession d'un enfant du siècle* in order to compose hastily a long poem, the literary merit of which is questionable. Musset was usually loath to treat issues of current politics in his poetical works, but for once he decided to versify his stand on a hotly debated question of national policy. *La Loi sur la presse* appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in the issue of September 1, 1835. Thereafter, this *pièce de circonstance* was systematically excluded by Musset from all collections of his works that were published during his lifetime. Obviously the poet himself attached little value to it. Surely, if it had been signed by a lesser name than his, it would long since have passed into oblivion.

Since it is by Musset, however, it is included in all recent editions of his complete works, and these editions usually contain notes to explain the references to the contemporary events which occasioned the poem.¹ The most detailed comments are to be found in an article by Jean Giraud, which thoroughly explores the political scene of the day—Fieschi's attempted murder of the king during a parade to celebrate the fifth anniversary of the July Revolution; the miraculous escape from death of all members of the royal family who were taking part in this ceremony and who were under the regicide's fire; the special mass of thanksgiving held in Notre-Dame Cathedral to celebrate the sparing of their lives; the seizure by the government of this moment as the opportune time to present before the Assembly a censorship bill designed to quench all republican, Bonapartist, legiti-

¹ *Poésies*, ed. Jean Le Maire (Paris, 1949), pp. 376-77; *Poésies complètes*, ed. Maurice Allem (Paris, 1951), pp. 680-82.

mist, or other opposition to Louis-Philippe, either in the press or in the theater.² All these matters, together with Musset's opposition to the censorship bill, form the subject of the first twenty-seven stanzas of the poem *La Loi sur la presse*. We are not concerned with them here.

At the end of the twenty-seventh stanza, however, Musset states that one of the most serious consequences of the proposed bill is the deportation of all offenders. Aristophanes is represented as addressing the people of France as he says: "Pendant que vous dormez, on bâillonne la presse/ Et la chambre en travail enfante une prison." This *prison* is the penal colony which Musset imagines being devised to receive the poor dreamers who dare voice their grievances against the citizen-king's regime. The specter of this new type of imprisonment continues to haunt the poet throughout the remaining seven stanzas. We shall attempt here to trace the source of his ideas on deportation.

Such a punishment was never applied during the Napoleonic and Restoration periods. Mont-Saint-Michel was used as a prison in those days, and French prisoners were never sent farther from their homeland than that island fortress so close to the shores of Normandy and Brittany. At the end of January, 1835, a royal decree stipulated that persons sentenced to deportation and confinement were to be imprisoned in the fort of Doullens, in the *département* of the Somme.³

We must go back to the days of the Directoire to find a precedent for the establishment of such a prison colony as Musset visualizes. In the *coup d'état* of 18 Fructidor, Year V of the revolutionary calendar, various duly elected members of the government were arrested on the vague and generally unfounded charge of fomenting revolution. These politicians were sentenced to be deported to Guiana. Many were able to escape, but sixteen underwent deportation. Quickly following the first wave of sentences, various newspapermen, the *chansonnier* Louis-Ange Pitou, and a large number of Catholic priests were similarly arrested and sentenced without trial. Liberty of the press was effectively suppressed.

Any attentive student of French politics in 1835 might have been struck by the similarity between the impending censorship laws, accompanied by the threat of deportation, and the events of Fructidor. Indeed, in reading the debates on the issue, we are not surprised to

² *Revue Bleue*, 14 septembre 1912, pp. 327-30.

³ Louis André in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v. "Déportation."

find Fr
of whic
It is lik
reveal

Ther
the Fru
might l
Aymé,
become
recently
de Bar

In th
Barbé-
fact un
After a
market
in the
between
gives u
was de

Only
during
form o
his con
He eel
Marbo
how cl
the fac
deport
an int

⁴ Cor

⁵ J.-J.

net-Ouc

1799) ;

Temple

La Ru

Cayenn

For a

of the

tidor,"

⁶ Ref

of the

⁷ On

(Univ

find Fructidor evoked by the deputy Salverte in a speech, the text of which was printed on August 15, 1835, in the *Journal des Débats*. It is likely that Musset read this speech; his published correspondence reveals that he was a reader of the *Débats* at this time.⁴

There had been published ever since 1799 a series of accounts of the Fructidor deportation by various participants and victims. Musset might have known any of those works, those of Jeannet, Ramel, Pitou, Aymé, La Rue, or Dutertre.⁵ After an examination of these we have become convinced that instead Musset was indebted to a much more recently published one: the *Journal d'un déporté non-jugé*, by François de Barbé-Marbois.⁶

In the form of a diary written at the time of the events described, Barbé-Marbois's work was not published until many years later, in fact until a few months previous to the appearance of Musset's poem. After a limited first edition, the *Journal* appeared on the commercial market early in 1835.⁷ A publisher's announcement of it was published in the *Journal des Débats* on January 16 of that year. The similarity between certain details treated in this work and those of Musset's poem gives us evidence to believe that the latter's diatribe against deportation was derived from the former. Let us examine the points in common.

Only Barbé-Marbois, among those who wrote down their experiences during the Fructidor episode, dwells on the fact that this particular form of exile was brand-new in the history of the world. Throughout his concluding stanzas Musset too stresses this aspect of the question. He echoes poetically the prose of chapter IV, Volume II of Barbé-Marbois's work. A few quotations here from that chapter will show how close in thought the two writers are on this point. Incidentally, the fact that Barbé-Marbois quotes from Plutarch and compares his deportation to the forms of exile inflicted in Greece and Rome makes an interesting parallel, because all the stanzas we are here concerned

⁴ *Correspondance (1827-1857)*, (Paris, 1907), p. 12.

⁵ J.-J. Aymé, *Déportation et Naufrage* (Paris, 1800); Georges-Nicolas Jeannet-Oudin, *Notes sur quelques passages du "Mémoire" de Ramel* (Paris, 1799); Jean-Pierre Ramel, *Journal* (Londres, 1799); Dutertre, *Départ du Temple pour Cayenne, des déportés des 17 et 18 fructidor, an V* (Paris, 1800); La Rue, *Histoire du 18 fructidor* (Paris, 1821); Louis-Ange Pitou, *Voyage à Cayenne* (Paris, 1805); L.-A. Pitou, *Analyse de mes malheurs* (Paris, 1816). For a discussion of the contents and relative merits of the first-hand accounts of the episode, see Victor Pierre, "La Déportation à la Guyane après fructidor," *Revue des Questions Historiques*, avril 1882, pp. 441-442.

⁶ References to Barbé-Marbois's *Journal* in this paper use the pagination of the first edition.

⁷ On Barbé-Marbois, see E. Wilson Lyon, *The Man Who Sold Louisiana* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1942).

with in Musset, that is, XXVII through XXXIV, are also quotations from an observer from antiquity, Aristophanes, whom Musset imagines as coming back to life in order to declare his horror at this new mode of punishment.⁸ "Les rigueurs du bannissement, de l'exil, de l'ostracisme n'ont rien qui égale celles qu'on nous fait éprouver. . . . Plutarque, adressant des consolations à un banni, lui dit: On n'a pas limité les lieux destinés à ton séjour. On ne t'en interdit qu'un seul. En t'excluant d'une ville, on t'a ouvert toutes les autres. . . . Chez les Grecs . . . on ne savait ce que c'était d'emprisonner et de tourmenter l'exilé jusque dans son bannissement. Il avait le choix du lieu de son séjour" (II, 72-74). Compare this with Aristophanes' statement in stanza XXVIII:

On banissait jadis, au temps de barbarie;
Si l'exil était pire ou mieux que l'échafaud,
Je ne sais; mais, du moins, sur les mers de la vie
On laissait l'exilé devenir matelot.
Cela semblait assez de perdre sa patrie.
Maintenant avec l'homme on bannit le cachot.

In each stanza following the one just quoted, the unprecedented nature of this punishment—exile combined with imprisonment—continues to receive emphasis. In stanza XXIX, it is the metaphor of the *plante inouïe*; in stanza XXX, "c'est la première fois qu'on lance une prison"; in stanza XXXI, the phrase *un supplice nouveau*. The last line of stanza XXXII implies the same notion of novelty in punishment: "car le génie humain a fait pis que la mort."

After Barbé-Marbois makes the point that his deportation is a more severe punishment than other forms of exile inflicted formerly, he mentions another novelty connected with his punishment: the fact that it was imposed upon such a large number of men of several walks of life, whereas in antiquity exile was very rare, being inflicted upon only the most outstanding members of the opposition to a regime. "Jusqu'au temps d'Alcibiade l'ostracisme n'avait frappé que des citoyens considérables" (II, 76). After the case of Alcibiades, he continues, ostracism was abolished entirely. Under the Directoire, on the other hand, such punishment is applied much more indiscriminately: "Aujourd'hui . . . on déportera l'écrivain dont la plume,

⁸This is true of the original printing in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Editions published since Musset's death have needlessly changed the poet's punctuation to make Aristophanes' speech consist of stanza XXVII alone, instead of allowing it to continue to the end of the poem.

l'orateur dont l'éloquence alarmeront des ministres corrompus" (II, 79).

The same point is made in Musset's poem. The following lines in particular suggest that the punishment is too severe for the crime, since those punished are not the leaders of a revolution or heresy, but mere writers stating their minds:

Qu'ont-ils fait, direz-vous, pour un pareil supplice?
Ont-ils tué leurs rois, ou renversé leurs dieux?
Non; ils ont comparé deux esclaves entr'eux;
Ils ont dit que Solon comprenait la justice
Autrement qu'à Paris les préfets de police,
Et qu'autrefois en Grèce il fut un peuple heureux.

Pauvres gens! c'est leur crime; ils aiment leur pensée,
Tous ces pâles rêveurs au langage inconstant.

Another detail common to both works is the theme of leave-taking. Barbé-Marbois had married a Philadelphia woman, whom he had met during his period of assignment in the United States. In his book he describes the farewell visit that his wife paid him, and her visit with the other prisoners, shortly before they were put aboard the vessel that was to take them from Paris to South America. She had been in Metz at the time of the arrest and had not been able to join her husband until he was already en route to his port of embarkation, Rochefort. The prisoners' guards allowed Madame de Barbé-Marbois a scant half-hour or less to visit and comfort her husband, a meager reward indeed for the long and tedious journey she had made under such heartbreaking circumstances (I, 123-127).

The concluding stanzas of *La Loi sur la presse* also picture a scene of leave-taking. Those being deported are about to be put aboard the ship which is to transport them to their prison colony, as we learn from the verses: "Voyez-vous ces forçats que de cette machine/ On tire deux à deux pour les descendre à bord?" This scene is being witnessed by the citizens of America who have come to the port in order to say farewell to their liberty-loving French friends who are now paying the price for having dared to speak their minds: "Regardez, peuples du nouveau monde! . . . Enfants de l'Amérique, accourez au rivage!" These *enfants de l'Amérique* are most probably Philadelphians who have come down to their port where the French ship has put in to call before its final voyage southwards to Guiana. Philadelphia is mentioned by name in stanza XXIX:

Mais nous, notre océan porte à Philadelphie
 Une rare merveille, une plante inouïe,
 Que nous ferons germer sur le sol étranger.

The etymology of the name was doubtless significant for Musset. The liberty and brotherly love of the Americans is thus contrasted with the censorship and harsh restrictions of France. Barbé-Marbois too points out the contrast between the freedom of the press in Philadelphia, which he mentions specifically, and the censorship of the Directoire regime.⁹

So, when Musset calls on the Americans, as the symbol of freedom, to come down to the prison ship to commune with the departing Frenchmen:

Passez, Américains, passez tête baissée;
 Et que la liberté, leur triste fiancée,
 Chez vous du moins au front les baise en arrivant!

it seems that the poet was musing upon several passages from Barbé-Marbois's work, especially the scene of separation from his Philadelphia wife.

The last piece of evidence that we find for our contention that the *Journal d'un déporté non-jugé* played a part in the composition of *La Loi sur la presse* is the use in stanza XXXII of the vague word *machine*: "Voyez-vous ces forçats que de cette machine/ On tire deux à deux pour les descendre à bord?" What sort of a machine is it? Musset does not tell us, but since the ship is standing in the waters of a port of call and is soon to depart for the prison colony, we must assume that, during the period of time that it was docked there, the prisoners had been put ashore and had been held in some sort of machine in lieu of a jail, up to the time of departure.

If we consult Barbé-Marbois's work once more, we find that he used the word *machine* in a very similar connection. He was describing the vehicles in which he and fifteen others condemned to deportation were being transported from Paris to Rochefort at the time that his wife was finally able to join them. These were, said the prisoner, large uncomfortable iron cages on wheels: "de grandes cages de fer lourdes et non-suspendues, ayant une seule porte verrouillée et cadenassée" (I, 111). As many as six prisoners were crowded into one

⁹ "C'est par l'Advertiser, qui m'est adressé de Philadelphie, que j'apprends. . . . C'est en imprimer à Philadelphie plus qu'on n'oserait à Paris. Interdire à un opprimé de recourir aux presses et aux journaux pour repousser une injustice est un acte de tyrannie. . . . C'est à Philadelphie que l'anecdote m'a été racontée," etc. (II, 185).

of the three horse-drawn cages, during the entire ten days which the trip lasted. Upon their arrival at Rochefort they were transported directly from the cages into the ship's boat. It is probable that Musset's stanza XXXII is a reminiscence of Barbé-Marbois's description of leaving the cages at the time of embarkation: "Une multitude d'habitants de Rochefort et des environs couvrait les remparts et les glacis. Nous descendîmes de nos cages, et, après avoir été comptés et signalés à terre pour la dernière fois, nous fûmes enlevés de cette France où réside tout ce qui m'est cher" (I, 136). Among the various descriptions of the cages Musset might have read, that by Barbé-Marbois is the only one to use the word *machine*.¹⁰

That Musset is thinking of such a cage when he says *machine* becomes completely clear if we consider that in the stanza immediately preceding this one he says to the Americans:

Vos monstres quelquefois nous arrivent en cages;
Venez, c'est votre tour, et que l'homme sauvage
Fixe ses yeux ardents sur l'homme apprivoisé.

Barbé-Marbois's *Journal* shares with Musset's poem several significant features: insistence upon the novelty of the punishment of deportation, together with allusions to the relative humanity of exile in antiquity; the argument that exile should be confined to a very few important people; sharp contrast between Philadelphia and France, between free Americans and enslaved Frenchmen; and the description of convicts being brought forth from a machine in order to be put aboard a prison ship. Therefore we venture to say that the Directoire exile's book was in part responsible for Musset's angry protest against the impending laws. The forceful way in which Barbé-Marbois represented the horrors of deportation made such an impression on the poet that he was determined to fight against a possible repetition of them in his own day. He wrote *La Loi sur la presse*; he wrote it in such haste that it contains a number of imperfections. In particular, the uninitiated reader cannot be sure where the scene of leave-taking at the end of the poem takes place, nor from what machine the prisoners are being drawn during this scene. The source which we advance furnishes the answers to these questions and thus brings the poem into sharper focus.

Baylor University

JAMES L. SHEPHERD, III

¹⁰ "Les cages de fer ont une origine fort ancienne. On trouve, à l'occasion de ces machines, le passage suivant . . ." (I, 112).

The Prototype for Proust's Jean Santeuil

One of the main themes of Marcel Proust's posthumous novel, *Jean Santeuil*, is the relationship between the literary artist and society.¹ Proust was not here concerned with society as a source of material for artistic creation, but rather with the conflict between the duty of the artist to his work and that which he owes to society. It was his contention that society—taken in the sense of the *haut monde*—could have a detrimental effect on the writer, to such an extent that his talents might be totally impaired, or that he might be prevented from realizing them.

Although *Jean Santeuil* is an unfinished work, Proust gives us the key to the literary future of his hero when he says that Jean's talent will be repressed and that "[il] sera capable à trente [ans] d'entrer aux Affaires étrangères et d'écrire pour les revues" (II, 311).

As André Maurois says, this is an important respect in which *Jean Santeuil* differs from *À la recherche du temps perdu*. At the end of the earlier novel we must conclude that Jean's poetic capacities have been destroyed by his association with the *haut monde*. This is a tragedy in the strictest Aristotelian sense, for it depicts the downfall of the protagonist resulting from a defect in his character. *Recherche*, on the contrary, closes on a note of triumph with the plan for the masterpiece which the reader has just finished reading. It is a novel dealing with the quest for a vocation and it terminates with that discovery. But at the time of the writing of *Jean Santeuil* "... Proust n'a pas encore compris que cette porte, celle du salut par l'art, est la seule qui s'ouvrira devant lui. . . ."²

The theme of the individual artist's worth being destroyed by society occurs in Proust's earliest published book, *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, where it is dealt with in at least two stories, "Violante ou la Mondanité" and "L'Étranger." At the time of the writing of *Jean Santeuil* it was of major concern to Proust, for it was a possibility which menaced his own vocation.

Jean Pfeiffer has suggested that the desire to *parvenir* was the origin of the literary ambitions of Proust but that, once having begun the career of a writer, he experienced a sort of conversion to literature which obliged him to renounce everything else in order to realize his

¹ Marcel Proust, *Jean Santeuil* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952), 3 vols.

² André Maurois, "Préface" to *Jean Santeuil*, p. 18.

new-found vocation.³ According to Maurois, one of the motivating factors of Proust's decision to become a writer were the "humiliations mondaines dont nous retrouverons traces d'abord dans *Jean Santeuil*, puis dans la *Recherche*. 'Un écrivain se récompense comme il peut de quelque injustice du sort.' Celui-ci éprouve un urgent besoin de compensation, d'explication et de consolation."⁴ Proust expresses these sentiments in *Jean Santeuil* when he has the artist say in self-justification: "J'ai choisi cette vie pour y faire fortune . . . j'ai voulu en me faisant traiter d'égal à égal par un prince rendre à l'homme de lettres abaissé le rang auquel il a droit" (I, 253).

The name of Proust's protagonist suggests the historical person of that name, Jean-Baptiste de Santeuil, portrayed by La Bruyère and Saint-Simon, and mentioned by Dangeau and the *Dictionnaire critique*. One is led to wonder if there do not exist deeper affinities between them which might have led Proust to select this name for his hero.⁵

Denise Mayer, in leafing through the *Caractères* of La Bruyère was struck by the similarity of names, and this led her to ask the question: "Proust doit-il à La Bruyère le nom de Jean Santeuil?"⁶ From her reading of this portrait, given under the name of Théodas, she quite rightly does not insist on any similarity of character with Proust's protagonist, for he does not manifest the same traits ascribed to his archetype by La Bruyère.

We do not find in him the zest, the brilliance, the combination of fool and sage which make up the character of Théodas. Nor can we say of Proust's creation: "... il est bon homme, il est plaisant homme, et il est excellent homme."⁷ On the contrary, as Georges Cattaui has rightly stated, the characteristics of Jean Santeuil are egotism,

³ Jean Pfeiffer, "Marcel Proust et la Littérature," *Synthèses* (sept.-nov. 1951), pp. 223-228.

⁴ André Maurois, "Préface" to *Pléiade* ed. of *A la recherche du temps perdu* (Paris: Gallimard, 1954), p. viii.

⁵ It is a fact that there exists in the department of Eure-et-Loir a commune which bears the name of Santeuil. This same department includes both the Illiers of Proust's childhood and Saint-Simon's Ferté-Vidame. The following notation is found in Lucien Merlet, *Dictionnaire topographique du Département d'Eure-et-Loir* (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1861), p. 170: "Le fief de Santeuil était vassal du duché de Chartres et ressortissait pour la justice au baillage de cette ville." The commune is further described as being comprised of 45 houses, 47 families, and 181 inhabitants in Ed. Lefèvre, *Département d'Eure-et-Loir—Dictionnaire géographique des communes, hameaux, fermes, moulins, châteaux, ayant un nom particulier* (Chartres: Garnier, 1856), p. 14.

⁶ *Figaro Littéraire*, no. 403 (9 janvier 1954), p. 3.

⁷ La Bruyère, *Caractères*, ed. by Charles Louandre (Paris: Bibliothèque Charpentier, n. d.), pp. 297-298.

naïveté, snobbery, cynicism, irascibility, vanity, avidity, brutality, and "d'alarmantes traces de sadisme."⁸ Denise Mayer quite prudently limits herself to a "rapprochement" between the La Bruyère portrait and the "nom de Jean Santeuil."

Had she been concerned with parallels of character, she would have found in La Bruyère the letter written by him to the Chanoine de Santeuil.⁹ This letter reveals a different facet of character from that portrayed as Théodas, and one which could not fail to have interested Proust: the Chanoine's excessive concern with the favor of the members of the Condé family. A footnote to this letter sheds more light on the situation: "Les plaisanteries dont il était l'objet l'avaient rendu très ombrageux. . ."

This characteristic of the Chanoine was also present in Jean and because of it we see him fight two duels. There are also a number of scenes, notably in the sections entitled "L'Affront" and "Réparation" (III, ch. viii), in which Santeuil, after having been snubbed by the aristocracy and insulted by their servants, is magnificently vindicated by the Duchesse de Réveillon. In these actions we see exemplified what La Bruyère predicted would be the reaction of the Condés: ". . . ils sont incapables d'écouter les moindres rapports . . . la première chose qu'ils auroient faite auroit été de condamner les rapporteurs."

In Saint-Simon we find many of the elements and characteristics noted with so much verve by La Bruyère as belonging to Théodas. Saint-Simon is writing in a lower key and with a different intent. La Bruyère, as he says himself in the letter to Santeuil, has *defined* the character of his friend, not omitting his weaknesses and failings. Saint-Simon, on the other hand, employs the incident of Santeuil's death not as an analysis of character, but to point a moral in which his character is a contributing element.

The tale, as given by Saint-Simon, is briefly this: the Chanoine de Santeuil, "le plus grand poète latin qui ait paru depuis plusieurs siècles," had been for years a favorite of the whole Condé family. In the summer of 1697 he was persuaded by Monsieur le Duc to accompany him to Dijon for the meeting of the États de Bourgogne. There Santeuil amused the company by his wit and learning. During supper one night the duke emptied his snuffbox into Santeuil's champagne and ordered him to drink it. The result of this cruel joke was that

⁸ Georges Cattaui, *Marcel Proust* (Paris: Julliard, 1954), pp. 156, 155.

⁹ La Bruyère, *op. cit.*, p. 448.

the poet died in horrible convulsions twenty-four hours later.¹⁰ Saint-Simon begins this account by announcing its didactic purpose: to give the reader "un grand exemple de l'amitié des princes, et une belle leçon à ceux qui la recherchent." And the story seems to say simply that such frequentation can lead to death.

Like Saint-Simon, Proust declares his moralizing intention at the outset of his chapter illustrating the nefarious effects of society on the poet: "Le chapitre que nous allons écrire ne serait pas moins à sa place dans une étude psychologique sur les différentes variétés de l'ambitieux, dans une étude historique sur la société à la fin du XIX^e siècle que dans l'histoire plus modeste de Jean Santeuil" (I, 249-250).

The Chanoine de Santeuil's literary career as well as his life was brought to a close by an unthinking prank of Monsieur le Duc, to which he had lent himself by his presence in the duke's entourage. In Proust this fatal predisposition to worldliness with its attendant misadventures is raised to a higher moral plane. For though Jean Santeuil continues to live out his normal life span, his moral fibre has been attacked by such associations and his capacity for producing a work of art is destroyed.

Proust's primary concern in the chapter of *Jean Santeuil* entitled "Henri de Réveillon" is the effect of the friendship of Henri upon the poetic vocation of Jean. To this he adds the case of the painter Antoine Desroches and his friend Frédéric de Breslau, Prince de Brême. He likens Desroches to Balzac's creations, the poet Lucien de Rubempré and Eugène de Rastignac, in that he uses his artistic proclivities to further his social career (I, 252). But Proust doubtless feels that this could be interpreted as an attack more on ambition than on society itself. Therefore, later on he cites the case of the Comtesse Gaspard de Réveillon who, herself a member of the highest aristocracy, has no social ambitions to satisfy and who, nevertheless, is destroyed as an artist by this milieu. Proust says in this context: "Mais si l'on songe que l'automatisme appelé bonnes manières détruit toute spontanéité, tout exercice véritable de l'esprit, toute possibilité de poésie, on concevra aussi que la poésie, le véritable exercice de l'esprit, détruit tout automatisme et toutes les bonnes manières" (II, 310-311).

The dilemma which Marcel solved and which the two Santeuils tragically failed to solve is set forth in the words of Proust: "Bientôt par l'ascendant que les êtres pervers prennent sur les êtres . . . sans

¹⁰ Saint-Simon, *Mémoires* (Paris: Hachette, 1879), IV, 247-250.

volonté, le monde aura façonné le poète à son image d'autant plus vite qu'en l'habituant, par les appâts de la vanité et de la paresse satisfaites, à vivre en société, elle supprimera les forces de résistance qu'il aurait pu trouver dans les énergies de la vie solitaire" (I, 252-253).

It was doubtless because of this parallelism between the case of the Chanoine, as glimpsed in the letter of La Bruyère and as represented in Saint-Simon, that Proust chose to call his hero Jean Santeuil.

Columbia University

WILLIAM STEWART BELL

Gomia versus *Gumía*, *Gomía*: an Emendation

Prof. J. Corominas, in the second volume of his masterly *Diccionario crítico etimológico* has, it seems to me, created some confusion for the scholar who may chance to investigate one or both of the two terms, *gomia* and *gumía* (or *gomía*). The purpose of this brief note is to attempt to clarify the meanings of these two disparate forms and to correct Corominas' documentation.

We shall begin by defining the two words, following the *Diccionario*. Under *gomia* (II, 146), Corominas prints: "comilón, tarasca, monstruo popular." We have here to do with a concept of something which devours, a nursery spectre, the monster often—but not invariably—equated with the dragon of the Spanish Corpus procession. The etymon given is "descendiente semiculto del latín arcaico y tardío *gūmīa*, 'comilón'"; the *i* is unstressed.

Turning next to the entry for *gumía* (II, 851), we find the following: "especie del puñal curvo que usan los moros." Here we are dealing with a type of Moorish scimitar, whose etymon is given as "del árabe marroquí *kummiyah*, ídem"; the *i* is stressed. A more complete definition of *gumía* is offered by Enrique de Leguina, in his *Glosario de voces de armería*: "arma blanca corta, encorvada, de origen arábigo, y uso prohibido, más larga que el puñal."¹

¹ Madrid, 1912, s. v. *gumía*. Leguina also fell into some confusion on this point. Under *gomia* he cites a text from the *Inventario* of Beltrán de la Cueva (1560): "una espada morisca . . . é tiene . . . un texillo de *gomia* labrado de hilo de oro." Leguina adds, "la acepción vulgar es la de tarasca," an observation which seems wide of the mark; the *tejillo* in question would be the sword-band proper to a *gumía*.

It is the documentation which Corominas brings forward under each heading which may present a danger to the investigator. Under *gomia* (he has no entry for *gomía*), he lists two texts. The earliest is from the *Victorial* of Díaz de Gámez—a chonicle composed possibly between 1431 and 1449—which Corominas offers as the first recorded use of the word. The second text is taken from the *Coplas* of the Comendador Román, found in the *Cancionero general* of 1511. Under *gumía* Corominas asserts that the first recording is that of the Academy dictionary of 1817, and presents a reference from Valera (following Pagés). I shall reserve the text from Díaz de Gámez for a treatment of *gumía*; I can show, moreover, that we may document the use of *gomia* as *monstruo*, *tarasca*, earlier than the passage from the great collection of 1511, where it has the same connotation.²

Lope de Barrientos, bishop of Cuenca, in his *Tratado del dormir e despertar e soñar* (a work probably written between 1435 and 1440), wrote as follows. “Según que por experiencia vemos que en las ciudades donde se celebra solemnemente la fiesta del Corpus Christi acostumbran a facer por artificio unas grandes bestias que llaman *gomias*, e cuando les quieren facer abrir la boca encogen e aprietan unas cuerdas, que para ello tienen artificialmente dispuestas.”³

If we turn to the *Victorial*, we shall find that the text in question reads thus. “. . . Grand gente de moros buscando a los cristianos por donde auían andado. Sacadas las *gomías*, a donde fallauan las pisadas de los cristianos allí dauan quchilladas, que a vna pisada venían a dar golpes veynte o treynta dellos.”⁴ The phrase is rendered by Joan Evans in her translation of the chronicle, “with drawn *gumias*.”⁵

It is not difficult to ascertain the source of Corominas' confusion: under *gomia* he states that he followed the *Vocabulario medieval* of Julio Cejador y Frauca. Turning to this work, we find that Cejador lists the references from Díaz de Gámez and from the *Cancionero* under the one spelling of *gomía*, although quoting the passages with retention of the stressed *i*, in the first case, and the unstressed *i* in the second.⁶

²The allusion reads, “espantable como *gomia*”; the context of the stanza in which the line occurs shows clearly that the poet intended a reference to physical unattractiveness, a sort of *coco*. (Ed. *Sociedad de bibliófilos españoles* [Madrid, 1882], I, p. 450.)

³*Vida y obras de Fr. Lope de Barrientos*, ed. Luis Getino (Salamanca, 1927), p. 9.

⁴Ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid, 1940), I, p. 135.

⁵*The Unconquered Knight* (New York, 1929), p. 95.

⁶(Madrid, 1929), p. 215.

We can now see that the text from the *Victorial* properly belongs in Corominas' great *Diccionario* under a separate heading of *gomia*, or else, as a variant form, under the entry for *gumia*; here it could rightfully claim the honor of a "first." We have also been able to antedate the reference from the *Cancionero* of 1511 by a clear half-century: Lope de Barrientos has left us what may well be the first use in Spanish of the term *gomia* as a figure of folklore.

Princeton, New Jersey

FRANCIS G. VERY

Some Unidentified Early English Translations from Herder's *Volkslieder*

Historians of Anglo-German literary relations have failed to recognize the outstanding role of Matthew Gregory Lewis (1775-1818) in the introduction of Johann Gottfried Herder into England. After Anthony Aufrere had published in 1789 *A Tribute to the Memory of Ulric von Hutten*, attributing, however, the German original to Goethe instead of Herder, "Monk" Lewis was, as a matter of fact, the first to bring out translations from Herder under Herder's name. The earliest of these, renderings of some ballads, appeared in his notorious Gothic novel *The Monk*, which came out in 1795. To be sure, a few British magazines had reviewed Herder's *Vom Geist der ebräischen Poesie*, *Gott. Einige Gespräche*, and the fourth "collection" of *Zerstreute Blätter* before Lewis published his translations,¹ so that Herder was not entirely unknown to the English reading public of that time. The climax of interest in Herder did, however, not come until after 1800.² The short notes published before 1795 dealt with the German originals, and only those few readers who knew German had access to Herder's writings. Later in the century and in the first decades of the next, translations as well as more numerous notices and reviews began to appear.³ But it can be shown that the attention of

¹ See Bayard Q. Morgan and Alexander R. Hohlfeld, *German Literature in the British Magazines 1750-1860*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1949, "List of References," Nos. 477, 617, 704, 719. For reviews and notices of *A Tribute*, see Nos. 587, 651, 654.

² Cp. Morgan and Hohlfeld, p. 79.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 92-3, and B. Q. Morgan, *A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation 1481-1927*, 2nd ed., Stanford University Press, 1938, pp. 228-9.

Herder's contemporaries in England was attracted chiefly by his philosophical, theological, and historical writings, while he was hardly known as a lyric poet.⁴ Lewis, on the other hand, had a unique share in acquainting English readers with Herder's poetry. He was the first to translate ballads from the *Volkslieder*. Moreover, not until William Taylor published his *Historic Survey of German Literature* (1828-30), did new translations from the *Volkslieder* appear in England.⁵ It can be said, therefore, that Lewis's renderings of the ballads, which appeared as parts of very popular⁶ works, play a significant and unique role in the introduction of Herder into England.⁷

It is known, though by no means generally, that "The Erl-King's Daughter," "Elvershoh," "The Waterman," "The Dying Bride," "King Hacho's Death Song," and "The Sword of Angantyr" are translations from Herder's collection of ballads, since Lewis indicated his source in most cases. Two as yet unidentified ballads, however, have to be added to this list. On these two, which were published in the first volume of the *Romantic Tales*, though undoubtedly written much earlier, Lewis commented: "'Bertrand and Mary-Belle'—'The Lord of Falkenstein' are in great measure taken from some fragments of old German ballads."⁸ The latter is, of course, a rather freely paraphrasing translation of Herder's "Das Lied vom Herrn von

⁴ Morgan and Hohlfeld, p. 93. Also V. Stockley, *German Literature as known in England 1750-1830*, London 1929, pp. 107-118.

⁵ According to Morgan and Hohlfeld's "List of References" (Nr. 2092) and Morgan's *Bibliography*, there appeared only one other translation from the *Volkslieder* during this time: "J. F.'s" rendering of "Elvershöh" (*Edinburgh Magazine*, I, 1817, 624 ff.). But this can hardly be counted as an addition to the knowledge of Herder, since Lewis had published his translation of this ballad as early as 1801 in the *Tales of Wonder* (first edition, pp. 131-3).

⁶ Most of the translations were published in *The Monk* (1795), which was a best-seller in Lewis's life-time, and in the *Tales of Wonder* (1801), which saw two editions in the same year. On the popularity of *The Monk* see William B. Todd, "Early Editions and Issues of *The Monk*," *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, II (1949-50), 3-24.

⁷ This fact has entirely escaped the attention of Stockley (see note 4) and Walter F. Schirmer, *Der Einfluß der deutschen Literatur auf die englische im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Tübingen 1947. Stockley erroneously assumes that the only poetic translations from Herder are *The Cid* (London 1828) and William Taylor's renderings of some of the *Volkslieder* and several poems from the *Zerstreute Blätter* (Stockley, p. 115). This view is corrected by Morgan and Hohlfeld's list. Also see my article, "Die erste Nachwirkung von Herders *Volksliedern* in England: unveröffentlichte Dokumente zu den *Tales of Wonder*," forthcoming in *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*. "Sir Hengist" in the *Tales of Wonder* (pp. 121-3) is not a translation of one of Herder's *Volkslieder* as Morgan thought (*Bibliography*, p. 607).

⁸ *Romantic Tales*, London 1808, I, p. ix.

Falkenstein" in the *Volkslieder*.⁹ Yet Herder's version ends with what may be called an open conclusion:

"Ich will dir deinen Gefangenen geben;
Zieh mit ihm aus dem Lande!"
"Wohl aus dem Land, da zieh' ich nicht,
Hab' niemand was gestohlen;
Und wenn ich was hab' liegen lahn,
So darf ich's wiederholen."

Lewis, however, rounds off the story by adding five stanzas:

15. The Lord of Falkenstein, who heard
The faithful damsel's plaintive word,
Unlock'd in pity Rupert's chain,
And gave him to her arms again.
16. —"Receive thy lover, constant maid!"
The Lord of Falkenstein, he said;
"Yet must he leave these lands of mine,
Nor evermore see Falkenstein."—
17. —"Now thanks! now thanks, thou gallant Lord!
May fame thy mercy long record,
Blessings repay this gracious deed,
And every wish of thine succeed!
18. "May joys unmixed thy steps attend,
While far from hence our course we bend,
And in some lonely forest's gloom
The remnant of our days consume!
19. "There many a tear shall Rupert pour;
There long his sin of youth deplore;
Shall weep, and pray, and fast, and pine,
And bless the Lord of Falkenstein!"—

This is obviously quite in line with the tearful sentimentality of the then popular gothic novels and of the Kotzebue plays which were in vogue on the London stage at that time and to which others of Lewis's works owe so much. The same may be said of two typical additions:

3. "And wherefore mourn'st thou, lovely maid?"
The Lord of Falkenstein, he said;
"Oh tell me whence thy sorrows flow,
And let me soothe thy bosom's woe."—
.....
4. Nor may'st thou wipe away the tear,
Which streams for one most false, most dear!"

⁹ *Teil I, Buch III, Nr. 2*. Lewis's version is printed in *Romantic Tales*, I, pp. 283-7.

And:

12. "My piercing shrieks shall reach his cell;
My groans and sighs my truth shall tell;
And when at length he breathes no more,
I'll die his prison gate before!"—

Instead of Herder's terse dramatic style, emotionalisation and intensification of the epic or narrative element are characteristic of Lewis's version. His preference for the atmosphere of the gothic romance betrays itself when he renders "Und wenn die Nacht ein Jahr lang wär" as "Cold blows the wind, fast falls the shower! / Loud howls the storm, it chills my heart."

The original of "Bertrand and Mary-Belle" is "Ulrich und Ännchen" in the *Volkslieder*.¹⁰ Again, it is rather an adaptation than a translation, although some passages are very close, almost word for word renderings of Herder. The most striking feature of the English version is the tendency to make the style epic rather than balladesque. Thus, Lewis bridges Herder's "Würfe und Sprünge" by lengthy amplifications, fusing the abrupt sequence of rather factual incidents into a smoothed narrative whole, e. g.:

"Hört, ihr Brüder alle,	"Hark! hark! I hear my sister's voice,
Meine Schwester schreit aus dem Walde.	Who shrieks to me for aid!"
	Full swift he sought the fatal place, Whence came the dying groan; And there with sad and gloomy face Sir Bertrand stood alone.
Ach, Ulrich, lieber Ulrich mein,	"Oh, Bertrand! wherefore here so late?
Wo hast du die jüngste Schwester mein?"	Where is my sister, say?"

Similarly, in Herder the dialogue between the murderer and Ännchen's brother breaks off abruptly and is followed only by the bare statement: "Lieb Ännchen kam ins tiefe Grab, / Schwager Ulrich auf das hohe Rad." Lewis, on the contrary, adds plenty of circumstantial epic incident to form a more coherent and continuous narrative action: Bertrand and Oswald, Mary-Belle's brother, get angry and fight; Bertrand is killed, and Oswald seeks out his sister, whom he buries, saying "full many a pious prayer," "while fiends caught Bertrand's

¹⁰ Teil I, Buch I, Nr. 18. Lewis's version is printed in *Romantic Tales*, I, pp. 273-9.

dying breath, / And bore his soul to Hell." This last quotation contains a motif typical of the gothic novel, or, more exactly the genre of the *Teufelsbündnerromane*, of which *The Monk* is an outstanding example. Another *Schauerroman* motif introduced by Lewis into his translation is the prophetic dream of Mary-Belle's fate (stanzas 11 to 17). Also the elaborate atmospheric setting which is developed from Herder's slight hints ("grüner Wald," "Hasel," "Wiese grün") is reminiscent of the gothic romance:

1. Pale shines the moon! the evening star
Illumes both grove and dell!
Bright are its beams, but brighter far
The eyes of Mary-Belle.
2. Soft echoes from the hill repeat
The nightingale's sad swell;
Sweet are her notes, but far more sweet
The voice of Mary-Belle.
3. Of truth unchanged and happy love
Now let each zephyr tell;
While Bertrand through the moonlight grove
Conducts his Mary Belle.
4. Through many a wood the fond ones past,
O'er many a meadow wide,
And gain'd a valley's gloom at last,
Which Mary trembling eyed.
5. There every object breathed dismay,
There all was still and dread;
The stars no light, the moon no ray
Athwart the darkness shed.

While the factual style of the Herderian folk ballad does not stress atmosphere at all and the most unbelievable things happen in this genre without any motivation whatsoever, in the sensational novel of the Radcliffe school even the most probable incident has to be carefully prepared for by creating a suggestive atmosphere and mood. Lewis evidently uses the latter style in his description of the scene in which the action is laid. Thus, his interest in gothic fiction bespeaks itself even when he tries his hand at Herder's ballads; and, with all that, it is important to bear in mind that Lewis chose from Herder's collection only *Schauerballaden* and *naturmagische Balladen*,¹¹ which, as literary types, come closest to his own works.

University of California, Berkeley

KARL S. GUTHKE

¹¹ On these terms see Wolfgang Kayser, *Geschichte der deutschen Ballade*, Berlin 1936, pp. 116-120.

REVIEWS

John Peter, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. 323 pp. \$7.20). THE core of this book, which one might not suspect from the title, is a consideration of Marston's satirical poems and plays in order to discover what the real nature of his satire and its motivation is. This consideration of Marston's work is preceded by five introductory chapters which build up a picture of the course of what the author calls *Complaint* (i. e. invective against the sins of the world as seen against Christian standards of behavior) during the Middle Ages in Europe and finally in England. He contrasts with this kind of writing a different kind of literary attack which he calls *Satire*. This latter kind is best seen in Chaucer and consists in attacking individuals. The sins for which an individual is attacked are the same sins we meet in the literature of *Complaint*, but in *Satire* it is the individual committing the sins who is attacked whereas in *Complaint* itself the attack is upon the sin and is generalized. Following the discussion of Marston there is a chapter on satire in Tourneur's plays and a final chapter on "The Legacy of Satire."

Professor Peter makes a useful distinction between the two kinds of attack found in older literature, although I think the term *complaint*, which already has been used for other purposes in literary history, is less good than some such phrase as moral invective. It seems to me, however, that he writes rather diffusely and tends to overprove all his points, giving a surfeit of evidence where somewhat less would have done just as well and made easier reading. In any case, his learning is solid and his conclusions acceptable. *Complaint*, he tells us, does not change or develop since the basic human sins and follies are always the same. *Satire*, on the other hand, being based on the specific and timely, does change; and so the satire of Marston, Donne, and Hall is very different from that of Chaucer. Part of the difference is the intrusion of classical satire (Martial, Juvenal, and Persius) into the picture. Satirists no longer used Christian morality as their point of reference but merely wrote attacks on sins and follies in order to show their learning and to shock their readers. Most of the satires of the 1590's were written by young men in their early twenties anxious to make a name for themselves.

Marston's satirical poems, says Peter, are indefensible on any moral grounds, but he feels that Marston was caught in the confusion of values which resulted from the replacing of Complaint, with its Christian standards, by the desire to imitate Roman satire. The fault, he feels, lies ultimately with the Renaissance itself. In regard to the dramas he maintains that Campbell's theory that Marston turned to playwriting because of the censorship of his poems is unsound. He suggests that the chief reason for the change was that plays were much more lucrative than poems. He also believes that in times of moral confusion and insecurity there is a tendency for authors to retreat into dialogue and narrative where the variety of characters allows them to be inconsistent and makes it unnecessary for them to take a definite stand. His analysis of *The Malcontent* shows very well how this works out in practice, especially in the uncertain handling of the main character, Melevoele.

Tourneur is taken up as a contrast to Marston. Peter shows that *The Revenger's Tragedy*, which he believes is Tourneur's work, is based on a sound and consistent morality whereas *The Malcontent*, although a better and more credible play, is not. For this reason probably he has a higher opinion of *The Revenger's Tragedy* than most readers have, but the logic of his defense of its author against charges of cynicism is sound. Shorn of its excesses, the play can be seen, as Peter says, as a late example of the morality type. The chapter ends with a very discerning comparison between Tourneur and Shakespeare in their handling of the relation between moral values and character creation.

Brown University

LEICESTER BRADNER

Sears Jayne and Francis R. Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956. xiii + 372 pp. British Museum Bicentenary Publications). THIS handsomely produced volume will be a delight to all who are interested in the history of books and libraries and to all who are interested in the methods of shelving and cataloguing books in the sixteenth century. The collection now known as the Lumley Library began with the books of Archbishop Cranmer, who had brought together over 500 books and 100 manuscripts as the working collection of a controversial theologian. After his effects had been confiscated

by the Crown the library came into the possession of Lord Arundel, who already had a fairly substantial library of his own. From him it descended to his son-in-law, John, Lord Lumley. He, again, already possessed a fine collection of books and continued to add to the library until his death in 1609. He left his library to Prince Henry, and on the latter's death in 1613 it became part of the Royal Library. Here it remained until it eventually became part of the library of the British Museum. On Lumley's death the collection was the largest in private hands in England, having attained to the size of nearly 3000 volumes. But the editors can now identify only about half this number in the Museum, and they devote a section of their introduction to an account of the various dispersals which they have been able to trace.

The catalogue here offered to us was made in 1596 but the original has been lost and the editors have made use of a copy made in 1609. Even this copy has lost its title-page and would not be identifiable as a list of the Lumley books if it were not for the existence of an author index which is properly labeled. The main bulk of the books listed in the catalogue is in the fields of theology, history and science. It will, therefore, not surprise Renaissance scholars to learn that most of them are in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Only 12 per cent are in any vernacular language. Because of the size of this library and length of time during which it was collected the catalogue will be of immense value to scholars who wish to know what Continental books were being bought in England during Elizabeth's reign. Professor Taylor has already used the manuscript catalogue for his studies in Tudor geography and Professor Johnson for his work on astronomical thought in England. Now that it is available in print many others will be able to consult it for similar purposes.

Modern scholars, however, will find it necessary to consult carefully the section of the introduction called "The Nature of this Edition." The Lumley catalogue is an excellent example of the kind of early cataloguing described by Archer Taylor in his recent monograph on book catalogues. The books are arranged by subject and by size, manuscripts are mixed in with printed books, and titles are sometimes vague. In the alphabetizing authors are listed according to their first names rather than their last names. The editors have done a tremendous amount of work in identifying titles, finding the present location of Lumley books, and preparing an index of proper names. Such are the vagaries of early cataloguers that even these welcome

aids do not always solve one's problems. The catalogue, for instance, lists a 1542 collection of Latin Biblical plays with its correct title but under the name of Gulielemus Gnaphaeus simply because he was the author of the most popular play contained in it. Gnaphaeus is duly indexed by the editors, but no one who wanted to find *Comoediae ac tragoediae ex novo et veteri testamento* would think of looking under Gnaphaeus unless he were a past master in the use of Renaissance catalogues.

Brown University

LEICESTER BRADNER

George deF. Lord, *Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1956. 224 pp. \$3.00). PROFESSOR Lord's purposes might thus be set down: first, to describe the essential aspects of Chapman's translation; second, to account for these aspects in terms of Chapman's interpretation of the whole work; third, to judge the value of the result. The first two purposes are, without question, successfully accomplished, and therein lies enough to make this a valuable book. Knowing what Chapman did, and why, the reader can then go on to agree or disagree (as I do) with Lord's judgment of the work in terms of authenticity, and rightness.

The character of Chapman's translation lies in its variations from, or liberties with, what Chapman knew to be the literal meaning of the Greek. Lord has illustrated this, with abundance and precision, by quoting the Chapman version, the Greek text, and an accurate prose translation for each passage discussed. Concerning this last there is one comment to make. Lord says (p. 10): "In my own prose translation I have made much use of Miller's [it should be A. T. Murray's] Loeb Library version except where it seemed unnecessarily archaic or unidiomatic." This is misleading. Lord does not so much use as simply reproduce Murray's translation, word order, punctuation, and all, except, as he says, he changes a word here or there. But in any case, the close prose makes plain what Chapman is about. Where Homer, via Murray, says (Lord pp. 95-96; *Od.* 6. 86-87) of the stream where Nausicaa washed her clothes and Odysseus washed himself, that "abundant water welled up from beneath and flowed over to cleanse garments however dirty they might be," Chapman has:

Whose waters were so pure they would not staine,
But still ran faire forth, and did more remaine,
Apt to purge staines for that purg'd staine within,
Which, by the waters pure store, was not seen.

Briefly, Chapman believed that (to quote Lord, p. 34) in *The Odyssey* "most material and doctrinall illations of truth" were cryptically expressed by his author in allegory." Odysseus is, or becomes, "the absolute man" (p. 117), who has had a "spiritual rebirth" (p. 93). His followers are "those students for the gut and life" (Chapman's translation of *Od.* 12. 328; see Lord, p. 64) and absorbed in passion "which man must control under penalty of death, spiritual as well as physical." Ithaca, which is "as it were their native land" (Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae*, translated by Lord, p. 38, with only qualified approval), becomes, naturally, "the goal of a spiritual pilgrimage" (p. 42) or (p. 64) "heaven."

It seems perfectly clear to me that Lord is right about what Chapman was doing with (or to) Homer, and how, and why. It seems equally clear that both Chapman and Lord are wrong about Homer. For Lord regards Chapman's interpretation as one that contains a great and unique amount of truth; he says so, often, both explicitly and implicitly.

As for the allegorical interpretation in itself; let us consider the adventure at Circe's house (*Od.* 10. 203-347; discussed, pp. 37; 110-116). "By its very nature this adventure requires that it be read as an allegory. Taken only on the literal level as a fabulous experience it has little meaning." The "meaning" would seem to be that, whereas Odysseus' companions, "those students for the gut and life," submit to swinish seduction, Odysseus' moral character and temperance or self control, in part, it seems (I can not follow this) conferred or symbolized in the moly-herb given by the god Hermes, proves superior to the temptation. This allegorical meaning would be more convincing if the story brought it out. But Circe only transformed the bodies of the men, not their minds; Odysseus did not resist any temptation but ate what was offered like the rest; he was immune to transformation, but just why is not at all clear, since though of course Hermes had given him the moly, Homer clean forgot to say whether or how he used it; the only person who actually resisted Circe through an act of will is poor despised Eurylochus, who suspected something fishy about the whole business and stayed off through a caution which verged on cowardice (nevertheless, here and here only

is temperance in action, and small praise Eurylochus gets for it from Homer, Chapman, or Lord); and, finally, it was Odysseus who had to be waked up and torn loose from his year-long feasting and dalliance and reminded by "those students of the gut and life" to get along with his "spiritual pilgrimage." Carpenter's theory of fairy-tale materials carelessly or unsympathetically handled is much more persuasive because it uses the facts of the text and explains them instead of wilfully over-riding them (*Folk Tale Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics*, pp. 18-20). As for Ithaca = Heaven, let me only say this, that before Odysseus ever got to Ithaca he had seen as much of "heaven" as he was ever likely to see, where Achilles and others in the asphodel were kings among the perished dead, and Achilles' opinion of such a heaven is on record (*Od.* 11. 482-491), and notorious, and not favorable, and Homer nowhere took pains to contradict him.

The allegorical view of Chapman and others as described by Lord rests on an assumption of original planned authorship quite at variance with established facts concerning the growth of the Homeric epics, where unity of authorship (which I would defend more stubbornly than most) remains at best a qualified term. It would be idle to censure Chapman for ignoring three and a half centuries of scholarship that came after him; but it is odd that Lord should ignore it in stepping back to revive Chapman, and commend him to us.

Still: *grant for argument* that this allegorical view is right, yet Chapman's *Odyssey* remains a landmark in literature, a curiosity, an original interpretation, what you will, but not a translation of *The Odyssey* which can be taken seriously as a translation. That all translations are failures should not be converted to mean that there is no such thing as mistranslation. All translators make mistakes. I am not here concerned with Chapman's failures of scholarship. But his "translation as interpretation" seems to say: "I know what Homer said, but he would have said it better if he had added (omitted, changed) what I shall therefore add (omit, change)." This is vicious in principle. Lord defends Chapman's changes of "faultless" for Aegisthus to "faultful" and "proud wooers" to "rude wooers" on the incredible grounds that "a doggedly literal translation would only make nonsense for English readers" (p. 59). This invites to anarchy. Much Elizabethan English, too, equally makes nonsense. Shakespeare's

For Warwick was a bug that feared us all
will mean to the modern reader that "Warwick was an insect (or

of course "bedbug" if the reader is British) who was afraid of all of us." Lord must constantly stop for exegesis of Chapman's English (p. 165 is a good example). Must we then bowdlerize Shakespeare and Chapman for the sake not of morals but of what I suppose people would call "semantics"?

More significant than Chapman's changes are his additions which express the moral Homer did not express. A good case is seen in a speech where Penelope fears she may give in and take another husband (*Od.* 18. 273-275; Chapman 18. 400-404; see Lord p. 58). The italicized lines have no counterpart in Homer; they are Chapman's addition.

.....Which, I feare, I shall yeeld to, and so wed
A second husband; and my reason is
Since Jove hath taken from me all his blisse.
*Whom God gives over, they themselves forsake;
Their greefes their joyes, their God their devill make.*

Chapman does this repeatedly, Lord notes it abundantly, and defends the "fidelity" of Chapman (see above all p. 180); in this case, he finds the addition "justified by Zeus's central (*sic*) statement in Book I." I can only illustrate the desperate results of adopting such principles by giving an example in practice. Here is Artemis' speech near the end of Euripides' *Hippolytus* (1327-1334), interpretively translated:

It was the Cyprian who willed that this should be, to glut her wrath. We have this rule among the gods: What one god wishes, no other will oppose, but gods must have their way, and *Aphrodite too, though I detest her, is a goddess; without her nor flock nor flower nor child can come to birth; were all men like Hippolytus, the world must stop*. Therefore our law, which I respected. Otherwise I would never have let her kill him.

Lines in italics are my own addition, and I have been otherwise pretty free, changing, for instance, "if I were not afraid of Zeus" to "our law, which I respected." The "moral" which I have written in is not mine and I do not endorse it as the moral of the play, but it stands, I think, on firmer grounds than most of Chapman's moral interpretations. Euripides makes the Nurse say much this sort of thing elsewhere in the play (447-450), but he could have made Artemis say it here, and he chose not to, and *that* is the whole point, enough, if there were nothing else, to make my "translation" a vicious mistranslation.

I should conclude this review, which is unhappily so full of objections, by repeating what I said earlier. Professor Lord makes

Chapman's position, and his own position, perfectly clear. The issue of fidelity will lie between him and any individual reader. The careful reader is put in a position where he can judge for himself. The analyses of Chapman's style are excellent. There is a useful comparison of Chapman's *Odyssey* with the same translator's *Iliad*, and with Pope's version.

Bryn Mawr College

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

Norman E. Eliason, *Tarheel Talk: An Historical Study of the English Language in North Carolina to 1860* (Chapel Hill: The Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1956. x + 324 pp. \$5.00). IN the first pleasure of reading it, Norman Eliason's *Tarheel Talk* seems to me more fun—serious fun of course—than anything since Professor Krapp's *English Language in America*, published some thirty years ago. I had forgotten, steeped in phonetic transcriptions, how amusing and linguistically enlightening the manuscripts of poor spellers can be. Drawing upon the documents of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina, Professor Eliason has gathered a fine harvest of data about American speech before 1860. He so cleverly presents and arranges his material, his quotations are so lively, that one gets the feeling of real speech, little dramas of independent, church-going, sinful Tarheels—including a number of indiscreet correspondents. The book is full of life.

Professor Krapp, depending upon the remarkable New England town records, assumed and lamented the South's lack of material of similar linguistic value. Krapp didn't know the South well, but he did ask his southern students and colleagues (such as William Peterfield Trent and Ernest Hunter Wright) what material was available. The truth must be that in 1925 the wealth to be gathered in the Southern Historical Collection at Chapel Hill could not be imagined except by a few men like its founder, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton. I was one of Krapp's southern friends and I wonder why we did not realize that plantation records, letters, diaries, wills, proceedings of courts and school committees, church minutes, if brought together in numbers would provide a sufficient bulk of evidence. One explanation is of course that southern genealogists and political historians had had rather special interests and usually above the level of naive English. (See Eliason's discussion of Church Records, pp. 44 ff.)

Social historians knew some of the important diaries, but not the small stuff. Fortunately Professor Hamilton was bitten with the bug of the true mad collector. It is said that there are now almost 3,000,000 items in over 3,000 groups. As it seems likely that his collection will grow and that other collections will be made, all Americanists will be in his debt.

Professor Eliason's skill as a writer and compiler cannot, it seems to me, be commended too highly. I don't quite know how he put the odds and ends together into such attractive patterns discreetly reinforced by linguistic learning. For Chapter II, *The Writings*, part of the answer is the folk-charm of the selections; for instance,

I think I have fattened up considerably since I were up in Chatham. I have got a better culler. . . . My old doman [old woman] sayes I am prettyer than ever. . . . we work in the weak. and when Sunday comes we Sit by our fire side and reads the bible and Sings. when we are not at preaching.

The letters from students and professors at the University are prime. One student writes (before 1800):

We have been as well as common except the spleen which is as bad as ever. . . . I swing by my hands every morning and knight; also have been taking Steel Dust steeped in Brandy . . . but cannot perceive whither it has done me any good. . . . Cursing and swearing are carried on here to the greatest perfection . . . they prefer Payn's *Age of reason* to all the books that were ever wrote since the creation of the World. . . . There is a Dancing School . . . I have entered as a scholar, being desirous to become acquainted with so genteel an accomplishment.

Another reports on his trip from Wilmington: "I didn't loose anything on the road only got my boots spoiled with tar in the botom of the stage." We regret that Professor Eliason does not forthwith determine the origin of Tarheel.

Most rewarding of all is Chapter III, *Language Attitudes and Differences*, where the author throws light on fundamental questions. Thus:

Common people were indifferent about their manner of speaking, and the cultivated were content with theirs. Correctness applied to written usage alone, and it was this that people sought to improve. The desire was deep and widespread . . . even slaves occasionally shared it.

Life on the frontier was necessarily democratic. . . . Western [North Carolina] language is characterized not only by freer indulgence in the colloquial—sometimes quite obviously deliberate—but also by greater concern for correctness.

[There is] almost no inkling that Negro speech had or was thought to have had any peculiarities of its own. . . . If slave letters can be trusted, Negro usage in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary was no different from that of the overseers or other semiliterate whites whose folk speech was unmodified by education. . . . What are usually regarded as distinctive features of Negro speech seem merely to be dialectal variants, which . . . the Negroes retain.

The Chapter on Vocabulary gives a good many first occurrences of Americanisms. The quotations are lively: "I wish cousin grissy had lefft her wedden off [delayed] until we had went home"; "College is thin of students also of money"; "Mrs. Robertson . . . will be willing to fire you a little party when you come home." Professor Eliason says that the "honey chile" tradition had not set in before 1860, at least in North Carolina. "'Lovey-dovey' language is virtually nonexistent and affectionate terms are never casually bestowed." Formality is the rule of address between husbands and wives: My dear Sir, My dear Mr. H., Your friend and husband James Gillespie. A young wife addresses her husband as Sir and concludes with "your affectionate frind." Affectionate parents of the upper-class instead of endearing words favor petnames like little jades, dear little brats, little plagues, and dear little sluts. For parents, Mother and Father are used by all classes, slaves included. "Mammy was uncommon, the only instances . . . being in cultivated writings." One child calls his grandmother Mama, another Mammy. (In my own family I have noticed Mommy for mother and Little Mammy for grandmother.)

One may wish that the author could have added a comparison of his North Carolina data with Krapp's New England. The way is opened to a lot of interesting studies, on one of which Edward A. Stephenson reports in the December (1956) issue of *American Speech*.

The chapter on Pronunciation demands some technical knowledge in the reader, but note these choice bits: Antnet (Antoinette), chaplin (chaplain), parliment (parliament), tomatoes rhyming with taters, mirth rhyming with hearth, wawful irons, spirt (spirit) and sperit, swrink (shrink) and surink, opem (open), yame (aim), sould (should), funal (funeral), brethen (brethren), sartin (certain), cartain and corten. The chapter on Grammar is easily followed. The usage "accept of the service" (1780) could occur today in the *Court Circular* of the *London Times*.

I have only one query: Why, especially after denying that there is or could be such an exclusive thing as North Carolina English, does

the author keep looking for it or, anyway, talking about it? The answer must be sought in States' Rights. General Lee's—no. Wade Hampton's—no. A North Carolinian's loyalty to his state? Still there must have been a North Carolina distinctive and pure, because even as a child I heard it described as the valley of humiliation between two mountains of conceit, with, shall we add, a glorious university.

Barnard College,
Columbia University

W. CABELL GREET

José María Azaceta, ed., *Cancionero de Juan Fernández de Ixar* (Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1956. Vol. I: cix + 412 pp. Vol. II: 510 pp. Clásicos hispánicos). THE voluminous MS of the *Cancionero de Ixar*, housed in the Spanish Biblioteca Nacional, is described and indexed in Gallardo's *Ensayo*. Mr. Azaceta has now published, along with the text of the poems, such variants as he has traced in a wide search among the more than fifty known MSS and editions of *cancioneros*. He has thus provided scholars with the first satisfactory edition of several fifteenth-century poems, some of them well-known.

The *cancionero* is a cumulative one: it seems to have been in the possession of the Ixar family for a number of generations, each of which caused new material to be added. The earliest date written into the text is 1470; the latest, 1645. This last date misled Ticknor, Gallardo, and Aubrun into thinking that the MS spanned three centuries. In fact, the compilation must have been completed, or interrupted, early in the sixteenth, for the last poets who are named belong to the period of Boscán and Álvaro Gómez. Azaceta distinguishes five phases of redaction, or sections of the MS. Parts A and B contain fifteen-century poems by well-known poets: the Marqués de Santillana, Juan de Mena, and their group. There is some duplication, suggesting that A and B were the result of contemporary but distinct collections. Part C contains two religious poems and some prose. In Part D we have minor lyric genres, satires of the *Mingo Revulgo* type, and poems in Catalan. The editor seems to feel that the final part is considerably less ancient because it includes a "meditación sobre la pequeñez de las cosas mundanas y sobre las verdades eternas a la vista de dos calaveras, dibujadas por dos manos distintas en el texto." This composition, however, full of reminiscences of Jorge Manrique's *Coplas*,

coincides perfectly with the macabre style, and even the curious orthography, some times used by Juan Álvarez Gato: I am inclined to think that it is late fifteenth-century.

In addition to its cumulative character, the *cancionero* is unique in its inclusion of moral treatises in prose: a "Doctrina y regimiento de la casa de San Bernardo," a "Tratado de moral," a "Tratado de retórica" (which is concerned with the ethics of speech), "Flor de virtudes," and the "Disputa fecha en Fez." With the possible exception of the first—the editor was unable to consult known fragments with similar titles—all of these sententious pieces were previously unpublished. This prose and the blank pages at the end give the impression that the codex was a kind of scrap-book of the *ixars*.

The introduction adds little to our understanding of *cancionero* literature or of the poets included in the anthology. Azaceta's major contribution is a system of *siglas* for referring to *cancioneros* which is at once more logical and more up-to-date than current ones based ultimately on Mussafia. His list of forty-seven *cancioneros* is full, but not complete: "hay algunos otros *cancioneros* de los que tenemos simplemente noticia de su existencia."

Both introduction and text are carefully printed for Spain; in addition to the expected mangling of foreign words, however, there are some serious misprints, such as the reference to parts D and E as C and D on pp. xx and xxi.

The Ohio State University

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

Michael Riffaterre, *Le Style des Pléiades de Gobineau, essai d'application d'une méthode stylistique*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1937. 239 pp. DANS ce livre, thèse du département de français de Columbia University écrite sous l'égide de Jean Hytier, l'auteur se propose deux choses, comme le titre l'indique: "essayer une procédure d'investigation stylistique" et l'appliquer à l'œuvre-maîtresse de Gobineau sentie comme œuvre d'art.

Quant à la première, l'auteur nous promet (p. 17) une étude vraiment et objectivement stylistique, c'est-à-dire se dégageant de la grammaire, de la rhétorique, de l'esthétique impressionniste; il essaiera, nous dit-il, "de concilier les vues spitzériennes avec l'étude méthodique, terre-à-terre, mais sûre, des procédés telle que la conçoit

l'école française" (en note: "celle de Marouzeau et Cressot," mais, p. 18, nous apprenons qu'une "liste des procédés stylistiques" fabriquée à l'aide de ces auteurs ne saurait rendre compte du style d'un auteur et équivaldrait à "attribuer une valeur à des procédés à l'état latent"). D'autre part, ne retenir que ce qui est original dans le style de l'écrivain aurait impliqué soit des jugements "impressionnistes," subjectifs, soit des comparaisons avec les styles d'autres auteurs contemporains, qui peut-être ne se prêtent pas toujours à la comparaison.

Restait la méthode circulaire de Spitzer: élan de l'intuition du détail significatif à la vue d'ensemble vérifiée par l'analyse philosophique [*sic*: lire probablement: philologique] dont les résultats à leur tour enrichissent l'étymon initial. . . . Seulement, la méthode a ses dangers, et principalement de donner une telle importance à une intuition toute subjective qu'elle risque de dévier les plus belles vérifications faites a posteriori. [Note: "Hytier, RR 41, 42-49, en a bien montré les dangers et souligné qu'il n'est pas rare que l'intuition entraîne l'éminent philologue à négliger une vérification, complète et philologiquement saine, sur le texte."]

La méthode de M. Riffaterre sera celle de "prendre pour point de départ le lecteur moyen ("au lieu du coup d'œil de l'aigle, le regard modérément perçant de vous et moi"): il étudiera "tous les cas où il y a convergence entre une forme donnée et une intention visible de l'auteur" (et les cas de convergence de plusieurs tels procédés), "en ayant soin de ne jamais rien retenir qu'un lecteur ordinaire ne puisse voir" (dans le cas de la convergence de procédés, "ce qu'un lecteur ordinaire verrait s'il ralentissait sa lecture ou relisait"). Ainsi on pourra arriver soit aux "structures calculées pour frapper le lecteur," soit à des traits "révélateurs des obsessions ou simplement des constantes psychologiques de l'auteur," c'est-à-dire à l'homme derrière l'auteur, compris dans son être et conscient et inconscient.

On aura remarqué, dans ces prolégomènes théoriques de M. Riffaterre, certaines contradictions évidentes: pourquoi "*concilier* les vues spitzériennes avec l'étude méthodique, terre-à-terre, mais sûre de l'école française," si la méthode spitzérienne est dangereuse? et si l'étude de l'école française (Marouzeau et Cressot) est sûre, pourquoi ne pas suivre leur procédé? On dirait qu'on ne gagne rien à ménager la chèvre et le chou. Mais peut-être semblerait-il que la trouvaille nouvelle de M. Riffaterre consiste à partir du 'lecteur moyen' (en l'aidant un peu, il est vrai, quand il y a trop de 'convergences') et qu'il y a entre lui et moi cette différence que lui reste "terre-à-terre"

selon les goûts de "l'école française," tandis que moi (selon le goût germanique, je suppose) je procède à "coups d'œil de l'aigle." Mais qui dit que j'aie jamais procédé en aigle et n'aie pas considéré mes observations comme celles d'un *lecteur moyen* (ou d'un lecteur moyen aidé par le critique)? La notion "d'aigle"¹ est importée, ou imposée, gratuitement par M. Riffaterre—et elle devient pour lui une tête de turc, facile à abattre. Ainsi si je relève les transitions suaves de La Fontaine, "les phrases tendant les mains" de Diderot, les cinq répétitions de l'épithète *grand* ou la "technique des ondes" dans les *Grandes odes* de Claudel ou l'instabilité des noms propres dans le *Don Quichotte*, aucune de ces observations n'est de celles qu'un lecteur moyen ne pourrait avoir trouvées lui-même et, en tirant de ces observations des conclusions sur la personnalité des auteurs, je me trouve dans la bonne compagnie de M. Riffaterre dont l'ambition semble la même. Ce qui est déprimant dans ces querelles d'"écoles," c'est que les élèves renchérisent sur les maîtres (ou peut-être expriment les pensées inexprimées de ceux-ci?): voilà M. Hytier qui a consacré à un de mes livres un amusant compte-rendu, pétillant d'esprit taquin, où, après avoir d'abord fait, il est vrai, un éloge trop généreux de mon "talent," il dénie ensuite, moins généreusement, toute validité à ma "méthode" (comme si "talent" formait un bloc inexplicable et n'impliquait pas méthode), aboutissant à une vague méfiance par parti pris, dogmatique, de tout ce qui peut rappeler de loin² l'intuition bergsonienne (le nom de Bergson termine son article); mais on sent dans son article le doute d'un homme qui a pesé sérieusement le pour et le contre—alors que l'élève prend déjà le contre comme acquis et dépêche dans une moitié de page l'œuvre de toute une vie de savant: ce qui était point d'interrogation chez Hytier est devenu point d'exclamation chez Riffaterre; ce qui était humeur frondeuse et gaie chez l'un, est devenu sombre et impitoyable esprit d'école, d'"école française," dont la méthode est "terre-à-terre, mais sûre"—et qu'on peut probablement employer *sans* talent?

¹ Ce parti pris contre 'l'aigle' nous rappelle fatalement le mot de Goethe (dans la poésie *Adler und Taube*): "Weisheit, du sprichst wie eine Taube!"

² En effet, M. Hytier semble moins craindre l'effet de mes procédés personnels que ceux d'adeptes maladroits à venir (?) quand il écrit dans son style taquin: "J'ai rêvé d'une admirable divulgation du secret de Racine en partant du truc des sept *oui* . . . , d'une élucidation totale de *Bajazet* au moyen de six *quoi* de son exposition . . . , d'une plongée dans la *mens ibseniana* par la voie de l'interrogation favorite de ses personnages: 'Que voulez-vous dire?'" C'est un mode facile de caricature que de rendre suspecte une méthode en imaginant des maladresses ou des excès hypothétiques dont ne s'est pas rendu coupable son inventeur.

Quant à l'application pratique de la méthode à "son" écrivain, M. Riffaterre procède de la façon suivante: après avoir montré dans un chapitre sur le "travail du style" de Gobineau que cet auteur, dans les élaborations successives de ses écrits, corrige son style de façon à lui faire épouser plus étroitement son idée, et avoir conclu que Gobineau est un des écrivains de race qui "ont un style," bien que point préoccupé de "beau style," il consacre trois chapitres à des phénomènes particuliers de ce style, groupés sous les titres "effets de style sur fond de langue" (effets de mots et d'alliances de mots, ordre des mots), "l'intensité" (répétition, accumulation), "la concrétisation" (abstrait pour le concret, comparaison, métaphore), pour aboutir à un chapitre "convergences de procédés stylistiques" (qui groupe en faisceau les procédés stylistiques discutés séparément dans les chapitres antérieurs) et à une "conclusion" qui rattache les traits de style particuliers groupés ensemble à la personnalité de l'auteur. Ce qui diffère de ma méthode, c'est la pluralité des traits de langue observés par le critique, qui pourtant semblent converger dans la personnalité bien définie de Gobineau. Si M. Riffaterre se refuse, comme nous avons vu, à traiter *tous* les chapitres de la grammaire et de la rhétorique française en tant que reflétés par le style de Gobineau, pourtant une partie notable de ces disciplines figure dans cette analyse stylistique, du mot à la phrase, de l'anaphore à la métaphore, etc.

En jugeant cette parties principale du livre de M. Riffaterre, on devra d'abord répondre à cette question: Gobineau avait-il vraiment un style personnel? Si l'on pense à des "individualités stylistiques" comme Nerval, Victor Hugo, Flaubert, Péguy, Claudel, Sartre, qui transforment la langue donnée, on répondra par la négative. Si au contraire on déclare "styliste" un auteur qui sait tirer parti des procédés de style déjà existants dans la langue, on peut ranger Gobineau à côté d'Anatole France, Bourget, Bergson même (qui, on l'a dit, n'a pas le style bergsonien). En effet, bien des faits d'expression relevés dans Gobineau sont des "faits de style" seulement au sens que Bally donnait à ce terme, c'est-à-dire "style de la langue" plutôt que parole individuelle—et ainsi s'explique la pluralité des phénomènes observés par M. Riffaterre: il y en a une quantité que tout écrivain français possédant sa langue pourrait employer, et quelquefois même un écrivain français de second plan, ou un étranger sachant bien la langue: une litote comme *une suite non interrompue de mauvais procédés* (p. 62), une hyperbole comme *cette âme vraiment sublime avait au plus haut degré le trait de la grandeur* (p. 63), un

“mot remarquable,” comme le prototype [des figures de Persépolis] (p. 67—est-il vraiment remarquable?), un cliché renouvelé comme *il lui flotta dans l'esprit comme un sourire* (p. 92), la reproduction du style oral d'un personnage dans un monologue comme: “Hé bien! à elle, qu'est-ce que le ciel lui a accordé en retour [. . .] Ma foi! je n'en sais rien . . . Probablement quelque chose [. . .] Oui . . . peut-être mon affection et ma gratitude” (p. 112), l'emploi du style indirect libre (p. 114)—est-ce que tout cela n'est pas bien banal? Est-ce que vraiment tous ces “effets de style sur fond de langue” démontrent “une rupture d'habitude, l'œuvre d'une volonté individuelle retravaillant le bien commun de la langue”? Vous, lecteur, et moi, écrivant en français, ne serions-nous pas ainsi tous de grands stylistes? (notez, dans la phrase que je viens d'écrire, le renforcement de *vous et moi par tous*, la prosopopée *vous et moi*, la question rhétorique!) Que si nous considérons les “tics d'auteur” révélateurs de “l'intensité” sentie par l'écrivain en élaborant sa phrase (M. Riffaterre pense ici autrement que M. Hytier, qui, dans son compte-rendu, niait la valeur révélatrice des “tics”), ils ne me semblent nullement remarquables: qu'un être “assévératif” comme Gobineau écrive 63 fois dans les *Pléiades* l'adjectif *absolu* et 25 fois dans une partie de cette œuvre *fort* (p. 120) n'est pas particulièrement suprenant (27 points d'exclamation en une page sont peut-être plus significatifs et rapprochent Gobineau de Céline). La “répétition voulue,” dans un discours de personnage rendu par l'auteur, de mots comme *jamais surtout, jamais, dis-je, au grand jamais ou non, une telle bande ne mérite pas de vivre, non, cette vermine coassante ne peut exister* n'est sûrement pas en dehors des habitudes de style du français parlé. Et la syllepse *tenu dans un double étau et par la main et par l'argumentation du prince* (relevée par O'Brien dans Proust), est sûrement d'un effet moins fort que les cas similaires chez Dickens, qui se réclame d'une longue tradition de ce que chez Cervantès ou Quevedo on a appelé “congruence dans l'incongru.” De même ce que j'appellerais la “chaîne généalogique” (. . . *un architecte qui connaissait un évêque, obtint de ce prélat de [le] recommander à un constructeur de navires, lequel parla . . . à un directeur de théâtre, et celui-ci s'adressa à une danseuse*) n'est chez Gobineau et Léon Bloy qu'une réédition d'un passage célèbre du *Candide* de Voltaire, qui lui-même parodie les généalogies bibliques (v. mon travail *A Method of Interpreting Literature*). Qu'y a-t-il encore de remarquable dans les accumulations de trois membres comme (p. 149) *la Grande-Bretagne était aussi la plus pittoresque, la plus*

imposante et la plus délicieuse des régions habitées ou dans le groupe binaire (p. 162) *ce que l'esprit peut avoir de plus délicat, le cœur de plus aimable?* Je ne puis reconnaître, d'après les exemples (pp. 184 sequ.) aucun "bouillonnement d'images" dès que Gobineau parle d'un de ses thèmes essentiels, ni aucune originalité grande (disons: claudelienne) dans la "longueur de la métaphore" (qu'est-ce que c'est d'ailleurs que "la longueur" d'une métaphore?) qui exprime le motif de "dépouiller son vieil homme"; est-ce que "la glace de la colère se fond autour de mon cœur" est inouï (après Victor Hugo, *Tristesse d'Olympio*: "Comptant dans notre cœur, qu'enfin la glace atteint . . . chaque douleur tombée et chaque songe éteint")?

D'autre part, si nous partions de la psychologie de l'écrivain, telle qu'elle est décrite dans la "conclusion," dont les traits essentiels sont: 1) la quête de l'absolu, 2) l'ironie, 3) la tendance vers le style parlé, 4) et vers la poésie, et que nous nous demandions quel style pourrait correspondre à cet "homme," nous n'arriverions jamais au style de Gobineau, tel qu'il apparaît dans la plupart des chapitres de l'étude antérieure. Les traits 1, 2, 3, pris ensemble demanderaient un style à la Péguy (v. à la page 111 une période qui pourrait à la rigueur passer pour "du Péguy"). Ce n'est que l'ironie, que M. Riffaterre traite seulement dans son chapitre des "convergences des traits stylistiques," qui se manifeste vraiment dans son style,³ les autres traits ne se traduisant pas dans une langue véritablement à lui. Ainsi le goût de l'absolu se manifesterait, selon M. Riffaterre, dans les "tics," le rythme ternaire et binaire, les métaphores, etc.—nous avons vu auparavant comment peu hardis sont ces procédés de style chez Gobineau. De même, M. Riffaterre semble exagérer énormément les envois poétiques de son héros. Ainsi dans ce passage rendant les pensées d'Aurora:

Aurora pensait souvent, en contemplant ces arbres qui frissonnaient avec une calme tendresse sous les caresses [*sic*: cacophonie évidente!] de la brise, ces grandes herbes inclinées au vent, ces fleurs ouvertes et élevant leurs lèvres vers l'amant que le souffle de l'air leur apportait. . . . "Moi, aussi, je suis une plante amoureuse. Je vis, je respire pour l'amour. Chaque pensée que je reçois de lui me rend heureuse! Je vivrai de lui et n'aurai rien que par lui! Je passerai comme ce qui végète à cette heure, grandit, verdit, s'épanouit et

³ Et peut-être aussi l'invective qui lui fait accumuler les épithètes dénigrantes—mais Céline nous a habitués à d'autres températures! A noter aussi le manque de pensée forte et claire de Gobineau dans le classement de ses ennemis: voir à la page 207 le soi-disant tableau de l'humanité comprenant "les imbéciles," "les drôles," et "les brutes."

tombera à l'automne, mais tombera pour regrandir, reverdir, s'épanouir de nouveau à la résurrection du printemps,"

il considère les paroles de la jeune femme comme "monologue intérieur" (je n'y vois qu'un "monologue," si le terme "monologue intérieur" doit être réservé au genre narratif introduit par V. Hugo, Dostoïevski, Desjardins et Joyce) formant "un véritable poème en prose" (mon Dieu, combien Baudelaire est d'une autre puissance!), qui doit sa valeur affective, entre autres choses (banales à mon goût), au "coup de surprise de la métaphore initiale, d'une belle audace." Or, il ne peut y avoir de surprise, puisque dès la partie non-monologique Aurora identifiait les plantes avec des femmes amoureuses; ce "*Moi aussi, je suis une plante amoureuse*" me semble d'un pédantisme en même temps lourd et mièvre—de même que la répétition des "mots les plus incantatoires—*amour-heureux*" (qui me semblent avoir perdu aujourd'hui leur charme). Et l'énumération de verbes répétés avec le préfixe *re-* pour signifier la 'résurrection' n'appuie-t-elle pas trop?

Somme toute, le livre de M. Riffaterre est plutôt (en harmonie avec Bally) une analyse des moyens stylistiques donnés à la langue française du XIX^e siècle à base d'exemples tirés de Gobineau que l'analyse du style d'un grand prosateur ayant ouvert de nouveaux horizons à cette langue. Aucun aigle de la stylistique n'est nécessaire pour découvrir des nuances de style courantes. Et si la bête noire de l'auteur, la "critique impressionniste," est exclue de son œuvre, c'est qu'il n'y a rien de mystérieux (qui serait accessible seulement à une telle critique) dans le style de Gobineau. Ainsi la méthode "terre-à-terre, mais sûre de l'école française" semble s'adapter admirablement à l'étude d'un style sans grande originalité.

The Johns Hopkins University

LEO SPITZER

André Martinet, *La Description phonologique, avec application au parler franco-provençal d'Hauteville (Savoie)* (Geneva: Droz, and Paris: Minard, 1956. 108 pp. Société de publications romanes et françaises, 56). MARTINET'S description of the phonemic pattern of the Hauteville dialect appeared first in 1945, in volume XV (1939) of the *Revue de linguistique romane*. References to this most useful article have since appeared in linguistic publications, either in connection with studies on the historical evolution of Romance (cf. A. G. Juilland and A. G. Haudricourt, *Essai pour une histoire struc-*

de
gue
gue
go,
en
!),
t),
Or,
ue
Vo
en
ts
du
ec
?
ie
ue
ue
ix
re
le
st
e
-
t

turale du phonétisme français, Paris, 1949), or with reference to problems of bilingualism (cf. U. Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, New York, 1953). Martinet has now transformed his article into an introductory manual on phonemic description, enlarging the theoretical portions of his work, and assigning to the actual descriptions of the dialect the role of practical illustration.

The first three chapters of the work form the theoretical part: (1) general remarks on descriptive linguistics, (2) a brief introduction to general phonetics outlining the phonetic features most commonly utilized for phonemic contrast, (3) a general introduction to phonemics, discussing the concepts of the phoneme, opposition, correlation, neutralization, etc. Chapters 4 to 10 give the actual description of the Hauteville dialect and show in detail how the identity of a phoneme is established, how the phonemes are grouped into a phonemic system, how the so-called prosodic features are to be described, etc.

Professor Martinet never tells the reader that he is often discussing controversial points. On such problems as the distinction between vowel and consonant, or the question of how to interpret an articulation as either one or two phonemes, Martinet simply presents his own well-known points of view. There is no reference to the articles in which Martinet originally presented his opinions. As a matter of fact, there is no bibliography, no mention of other schools of thought. Considering that this book is meant as a beginner's manual, this is probably a most praiseworthy procedure: I think it would be fatal to introduce the beginner to controversy before he has grasped the essentials of the subject matter.

The main distinctions between Martinet's (European) type of phonemics and American schools of thought are well known and need to be mentioned only in passing: The phoneme is not the ultimate unit of speech, but only a simultaneous articulation of "distinctive" or "pertinent" features. It is defined according to "function" rather than according to purely formal criteria. Within the structure of the language it is in "opposition" to other phonemes. Two phonemes which are distinguished by only one pertinent feature (/p/ and /b/ distinguished by voice) are in an "exclusive relationship" (*rapport exclusif*). A series of phonemes in exclusive relationship (p/b, f/v, t/d, etc.) form a "correlation." All the pertinent traits which two phonemes in exclusive relationship have in common are the "Archiphoneme." If the difference between two phonemes can not be utilized in certain positions (t/d at the end of the word in

German, etc.) the opposition between the phonemes is "neutralized." (For additional discussion of the difference between Martinet's approach and the Bloomfield school of phonemics, see J. P. Soffetti's recent review of Martinet's *Économie des changements phonétiques* in *Symposium*, x (1956), 334-337.) The actual description of the Hauteville dialect and the method of establishing the phonemic units by a process of commutation and inspection of contrasts made by sounds standing in the same environment makes it once again clear that, in spite of theoretical differences between the various schools of phonemics, the results arrived at and the practical methods of analysis are pretty much the same.

One of the major differences between Martinet's approach and that of most American linguists lies in the treatment of the so-called suprasegmental or secondary phonemes: stress, juncture, intonation. While most linguists in this country consider them as part of the phonemic system proper and devote a good deal of their time and energy to giving an accurate description of precisely these features, Martinet and most other Europeans have relegated them to a somewhat secondary position outside the real phonemic system, as representing prosodic features which are not to be described with the same precision as the phonemes proper. Here, I think, the divergence in theoretical approach creates real practical problems and differences.

First of all I think that it is in this area that Martinet runs into some terminological problems: he explains that the function of a phonemic feature may be distinctive, demarcative, contrastive and expressive (p. 37). Is then the juncture which distinguishes—to quote again a well-worn example—*night rate* from *nitrate*, demarcative or is it distinctive? Martinet explains (p. 13) that the interrogative intonation which distinguishes *il pleut?* from *il pleut*, is in a different class from other significant units (morphemes): (1) because it is suprasegmental, (2) because it can not be analysed into successive units, and (3) because it is a fairly universal type of signal. Thus it is not necessarily a part of the phonemic description, which concerns itself only with the specific characteristics of the language to be described. I wonder whether some of the differences between Martinet and the linguists of the Bloomfield school are not caused by two circumstances: the latter have usually been concerned with English, and—unlike the Europeans—they are dealing with pedagogical problems. To analyze an intonation pattern into successive units is of course precisely what American linguists like Pike, Fries,

Trager, etc. have been trying to do for some time, and their task is facilitated by the fact that in a stress accent language like English it seems possible to correlate pitch levels with degrees of stress. In a language like French this can not be done. From the point of view of the teacher of a foreign language it is also difficult to see why Martinet refers to an intonation pattern as a more or less universal signal, and gives to his students the impression that there are only minor differences (if any) in interrogative or affirmative intonation between languages. Foreign language teachers know better. A Spaniard, for instance, will often misinterpret the English question "Is he a student?" as a statement, because the intonation pattern used in English (lowering of pitch at the end of the utterance) does not correspond to the Spanish pattern, which ends on a high pitch. (Cf. Robert Lado, *Linguistics across Cultures*, Ann Arbor, 1957, p. 74).

But whatever the differences may be between the various schools of linguistics and phonemic analysis, Professor Martinet is to be thanked for having given us such an admirably clear and concise text book on phonemic analysis. Even those who do not agree with Martinet's theories will want to refer their students to Martinet's book—not necessarily as a model to be followed in phonemic description, but as the clearest and most concise statement of an important school of thought in modern linguistics.

University of Michigan

ROBERT L. POLITZER

Didrik Arup Seip, *Palaeography B Norge og Island* (Stockholm: Albert Bonnier, Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.; København: J. H. Schultz, 1954. iv + 168 pp.). IT is impossible in a short review to do justice to this great compendium of the palaeography of the West Norse languages; it is hard enough to report what it is, following the bare outlines of its chapter headings. The first chapter asks: "When did Norwegians and Icelanders learn the Latin script?" The answer is: when they first came in contact with Christianity in the British Isles, Ireland, Scotland, and England. Some of the Icelandic settlers had been converted to Irish Christianity. They recognized Irish books left by the Irish hermits who were first in Iceland. King Hákon, foster son of King Athelstan of England (Aðalsteinsfóstri), tried to introduce Old English Christianity into

Norway, while by the year 1000 the missionary king Ólafr Tryggvason succeeded in ramming it down the throats of Norwegians and Icelanders alike, though at least the Icelanders agreed by law. His methods caused some relapse in Norway where Christianity was fully reinforced by the saintly King Ólafr Haraldsson especially by his presumable martyrdom in 1030. Even he had English clerks or clerics educated in England. One is not surprised, then, to find in the earliest manuscripts, both in Norway and Iceland, English mannerisms of writing, dating from the eleventh and twelfth centuries in England. Such are the insular *f*, *r*, *y* (*wen*), *þ*, and *ð*, but not the insular *g*. The insular *r* was soon replaced by the Carolingian or Anglo-French *r* (since the insular one was easily confused with *n*). The insular *y* (*wen*) did not remain very long, either, but insular *f* remained for centuries both in Norway and Iceland (called *bagga-eff* in Icelandic manuscripts after the Reformation) and, while *þ* and *ð* have both been lost in Norway, they are still both preserved in Icelandic script and printing. According to an Anglo-French palatal rule the French and English preferably spelled *k* before front vowels (*i*, *e*, *æ*), *c* before back vowels (*a*, *o*, *u*) and *q* before *u*. This was imitated in Norway and, to a large extent, in Iceland, but the famous Icelandic twelfth century grammarian reacted against this rule (perhaps following Old English) and spelled *c* in all positions, including the one before *u* thus eliminating the Latin *q* from the alphabet. Likewise, the Icelanders and Norwegians might either spell their rounded front vowels (German *ü* and *ö*) in the Old and Late Old English way with *y* and *eo* or in an Anglo-Norman way with *u* and *o*. All these spelling occur in the oldest Icelandic and Norwegian manuscripts, e. g., the Norwegian and Icelandic *Homilie-books*, both dating from the twelfth century. All this makes up a very intricate pattern of early influences and later distribution in Norway and Iceland. For instance, though the present orthography of Iceland has both *þ* and *ð*, *þ* was, apparently, only used in the oldest Icelandic manuscripts; the duality came later as a Norwegian influence. In general, Norway was the leader in the development, not least so after the Icelanders became dependent upon a Norwegian archbishop in Nidarós, Trondheim, and the Norwegian king in Nidarós, Bergen or Osló. There is one baffling instance of Norwegian influence, the orthography of the famous *Codex Regius* of the *Eddic Poems* (dating from ca. 1270). Is the influence a general one and contemporary with the poem, or is it due to old Norwegian manu-

scripts (before 1200) copied by the compiler? D. A. Seip thinks the latter to be the case, and one would hardly think that any one could gainsay his enormous learning. But a Swedish scholar, Gustaf Lindblad after seventeen years of study comes to the opposite conclusion: the influence is general, contemporary with the manuscript.

Reverting to report of the contents of the book: chapter II-III deal with the beginnings up to 1225 in Norway and Iceland, chapters IV-V describe conditions during the period 1225-1300 in both countries, and chapters VI-VII the period 1300 up to the Reformation.

In preparation for this work Seip had done an excellent history of the Norwegian language, *Norsk Språkhistorie* (Oslo 1930). But no one has left as many works on West Norse palaeography as the American-Norwegian G. T. Flom, Professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literatures at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. It was too bad that he did not live to compile this great survey of the field. This is, of course, not to say that he would have done a better job than Professor Didrik Arup Seip of Oslo, whose name is always a guarantee of fine work.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Gustaf Lindblad, *Studier i Codex Regius av äldre Eddan*. With an English Summary (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954. xxiv + 328 pp.). THIS is a very important study of the *Codex Regius* or the main manuscript of the *Elder Edda*. The author asks himself: what can we infer from the language and the script of the manuscript concerning the origin of the collection of the Eddic lays? Earlier answers to these questions have been given by those editors of the Eddic poems, who have concentrated on the palaeographic and orthographical side of the codex, notably Sophus Bugge (1867), L. Wimmer, and Finnur Jónsson (1891 and 1932). On palaeographical and orthographical grounds, these men agreed that the *Codex Regius* was most closely related to two other Icelandic manuscripts, *Kringla* and *Staðarhólsbók A*. These manuscripts could be dated to the years 1265-1280, hence the *Codex Regius* was probably from ca. 1270. While these scholars based their results on what to them seemed relevant features in these manuscripts, Lindblad extends his basis of comparison to include all Icelandic manuscripts from their beginning

in the twelfth century up to ca. 1325. Nevertheless, he comes to the same conclusion, first reached by Bugge.

Since Bugge, too, all editors have agreed that the codex is a copy of another book or books; he thought that the original (or originals) might date from ca. 1240, but Finnur Jónsson, in 1932, maintained that there must be *one* original and that it must date from 1200 or before that time. Lindblad scrutinizes the codex to get an answer to these questions. He maintains that Finnur Jónsson is wrong in two respects. In the first place there are many differences, characteristic of different parts of the *Codex*; thus, the mythological poems differ in orthography and palaeography from the heroic poems, and some of the other poems show striking individuality, e. g., *Völuspá*, *Hávamál*, and *Alvíssmál* while *Völundarkviða* agrees better with the mythical than with the heroic poems. This according to Lindblad is best explained by assuming that *Codex Regius* was copied from many manuscripts written by different persons. One of these hypothetical manuscripts might be a collection of mythical poems, another might be devoted to heroic poems, and there may have been more. Lindblad admits the possibility that the *Codex Regius* may be a copy of *one* manuscript, but that one manuscript must then have been based on many. He does not admit that Finnur Jónsson could be right in dating the source of *Codex Regius* before 1200. On the contrary he maintains that the manuscript source or sources of the *Codex Regius* are best assigned to the first half of the thirteenth century and that Bugge's date, before 1240, is quite reasonable. Already Bugge had noticed that the compiler of *Sæmundar Edda* had in one place used the *Snorra Edda*. Professor Elias Wessén believes that Snorri may himself have been responsible for starting men on collecting the Eddic lays. But these assumptions would not fit the theory of D. A. Seip, who believes that some of the Eddic poems were written from Norwegian manuscripts of the twelfth century. Lindblad does not quite reject his theories, but believes that the Norwegian influence demonstrable in the *Codex Regius* is probably a general Norwegian influence at the time of the *Codex Regius*.

This fundamental work cannot be too highly praised.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

the
ppy
ls)
ned
or
ver
in
rac-
ems
and
pá,
the
lad
rom
po-
her
ore.
ppy
een
be
the
the
nth
ady
one
hat
col-
the
ems
ury.
the
bly

N

otes

Four Benchmarks in Criticism

STUDIES IN HUMAN TIME

By Georges Poulet, translated by Elliott Coleman

When *Studies in Human Time* was published in France, it was awarded the Prix Sainte-Beuve, the Durchon Prize in Philosophy of the French Academy, and the Grand Prize of the Syndicate of Critics in Paris. Now, with the addition of an important new chapter on American authors, this brilliant and authoritative work of literary criticism has been translated for the English-speaking reader. French reviews were unstinting in their praise of this revolutionary method of philosophical criticism: "A masterwork." *La Croix*. "It could very well reshape the methods of literary criticism." *Le Soir*. 384 pages \$5.00

ISHMAEL. By James Baird

What, in our time, is the relationship between art and religious consciousness? To arrive at his answer, the author examines the work of some twenty recent writers—led by Melville—who created a system of symbols referring to the primitivistic cultures of the Orient as opposed to the Christian cultures of Western man.

"It is quite a brilliant piece of work, but brilliance is not really its most important trait. It is, I think, a profound book . . . a truly philosophical study of literature." *Susanne K. Langer*. 468 pages \$5.50

MALLARMÉ: Selected Prose Poems, Essays, and Letters

Translated with Introduction by Bradford Cook

Stephane Mallarmé, the leader of the French Symbolist movement, has been widely known and appreciated for his poetry in countries outside of France. Now, for the first time, it is possible for the English-speaking reader to have access to Mallarmé's critical writings on literature, music, theater, ballet, and individual artists. These critical writings include the most important, most original, and often the most beautiful pronouncements on art that French literature possesses. The translations are faithful to both the elegant style and the meaning of the extremely difficult French original. 200 pages \$4.00

THE ARTIST AS CREATOR. By Milton C. Nahm

What is the place of human freedom in the arts and fine arts? To what extent does the artist freely create, and to what extent is he a technician limited by his tools? These basic questions of aesthetics and the philosophy of art form the main theme of Professor Nahm's new book. In it he investigates the artistic process of creation, as opposed to the act of appreciation which he considered in his previous work, *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions*. 364 pages \$5.50

THE Johns Hopkins PRESS



Baltimore 18,
Maryland



out this month . . .

LÉGENDES ET CONTES NORMANDS

by Camille Cé

edited by Charles A. Choquette

**a delightful
collection of
traditional
tales -- now
published for
the first time**

For intermediate reading—This collection of stories about Normandy includes fanciful legends in addition to contemporary stories. Most of these stories are published here for the first time, and have been written especially for this reader by a well-known contemporary author, who writes of his native province with intimate knowledge and charm.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: Englewood, N. J. Chicago 16 San Francisco 5 Atlanta 3 Dallas 1
Home Office: Boston 16

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00 } **BOTH**
ELH regularly \$4.00 } **for**
 \$8.00

To receive both journals at a saving of \$2.00, simply send us your order with remittance of \$8.00.

Note: This offer limited to individual subscribers; not available to libraries and other institutions.



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMewood • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND